LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 45--78th Congress

Chapter 32--1st Session

S. J. Res. 96

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 45

FARM-LABOR APPROPRIATION, 1943. Appropriates $26,100,000, to be expended by the War Food Administration, to assist in providing an adequate supply of workers for production and harvesting of essential agricultural commodities through recruiting, placing, transporting, etc., farm laborers. Requires apportionment of between $9,000,000 and $13,050,000 of this sum among the State extension services. Restricts use of these funds to transport workers from one county to another and for enforcing labor standards. Provides for FSA labor receipts to be deposited in the Treasury. Permits use of CCC camps under this act. Protects rights to old-age assistance payments for persons doing farm work. Contains provisions to facilitate importation of farm workers.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON H. J. RES. 96.

January 6, 1943	H. J. Res. 7. introduced by Mr. Fulmer and referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. (Similar bill). Print of the Resolution as introduced.
February 5, 1943	H. R. 1728 introduced by Mr. Fulmer and referred to the House Committee on Military Affairs. (Similar bill). Print of the bill as introduced.
February 8, 1943	S. 680 introduced by Mr. Bushfield and referred to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. (Similar bill). Print of the bill as introduced.
February 17, 1943	Hearings: House, H. J. Res. 96.
March 10, 1943	H. J. Res. 94 introduced by Mr. Cannon and referred to the House Committee on Appropriations. (Similar bill). Print of the bill as introduced.
March 11, 1943	H. J. Res. 96 introduced by Mr. Cannon and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Print of the measure as introduced.
March 12, 1943	house Committee on Appropriations reported on H. J. Res. 96 without amendment. House Report 246. Print of the bill as reported.
March 16, 1943	H. J. Res. 96 debated in the House.
March 17, 1943	H. J. Res. 96 debated and passed House with amendments.
March 19, 1943	Hearings: Senate, S. 680.
	H. J. Res. 96 referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Print of the measure as referred to the Committee.
March 22, 1943	Hearings: Senate, H. J. Res. 96.
April 5, 1943	Amendment proposed to H. J. Res. 96 and ordered to be printed.
April 6, 1943	Senate Committee on Appropriations reported H. J. Res. 96 with amendments. Senate Report 157. Print of the measure as reported.
April 7, 1943	Motion to make H. J. Res. 96 unfinished business.
April 8, 1943	H. J. Res. 96 debated in Senate and passed with amendment. Senate asks for Conference and appointed Conferees.

April 9, 1943	House Conferees appointed. Print of H. J. Res. 96 with the amendment of the Senate.
April 14, 1943	House receives Conference Report on H. J. Res. 96. House Report 358.
April 15, 1943	House agrees to Conference Report.
April 16, 1943	Senate agrees to Conference Report.
April 29, 1943	Approved. Public Law 45.
October 29, 1943	S. 1493 introduced by Mr. Johnson and referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. To amend Public Law 45.

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 7

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 6, 1943

Mr. FULMER introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the training of nonfarm rural youth for farm labor, and for other purposes

Whereas one million men now on farms will go into the Army or industry during the next few months; and

Whereas two hundred thousand in addition to those now on farms will be needed to meet the expected call for a 5 per centum increase in production in 1943; and

Whereas replacements for the one million two hundred thousand above-mentioned workers must come from the nonfarm population with the exception of possibly two hundred and fifty thousand farm children who will reach working age next year; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture is asking for an immediate cut in food consumption about which "we have been too complacent"; and

Whereas, because we must build up stock piles of food for our Army, lend-lease, and domestic consumption to avoid a serious shortage in 1943, and a critical shortage later; and

Whereas rural nonfarm youth comprise approximately four million five hundred thousand individuals between the ages of ten to nineteen; and

Whereas these young people are located near the farms and can be recruited without serious problems of transportation and housing; and

Whereas most of them know farm vocabulary and many of them are familiar with farm work and duties; and

Whereas this group constitutes the most logical available farm labor supply; and

Whereas this rural nonfarm youth group can be most easily recruited and trained to lessen the farm labor shortage: Therefore be it

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That in order to assist in assuring an adequate supply of food
4 for the armed forces, the civilian population, and the Allies
5 of the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appro-
6 priated such sums as may be necessary to employ qualified
7 persons as assistants to train rural nonfarm youth for farm
8 labor and to supervise 4–H Club and other farm youth work
9 projects. Such assistants shall be under the direction of the
10 extension services of the State agricultural colleges. The

1 United States Department of Agriculture and the United
2 States Employment Service shall cooperate with the State
3 agricultural colleges in recruiting and training youths for
4 farm labor in order to carry out the purposes of this joint
5 resolution.

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 7

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the training of nonfarm rural youth for farm labor, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FULMER

JANUARY 6, 1943

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1728

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 5, 1943

Mr. FULMER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs

A BILL

To increase the supply of farm labor during the calendar year 1943.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Farm Labor Act of 1943".

SEC. 2. (a) Every individual who was engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor in any capacity during any part of the calendar year 1942 and who, on the date of enactment of this Act, or on the date after the enactment of this Act on which such individual receives orders to report for induction into the land or naval forces of the United States, is engaged in any capacity in the production of any

1 agricultural commodity, shall be deferred from training and
2 service in the land and naval forces under the Selective
3 Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until Janu-
4 ary 1, 1944, or until the date on which such individual ceases
5 to be engaged in any capacity in the production of any such
6 commodity, whichever first occurs.

7 (b) Every individual who was engaged in an agricul-
8 tural occupation or endeavor in any capacity during any
9 part of the calendar year 1942 and who on or after the date
10 of enactment of this Act is serving within any of the States
11 of the Union or the District of Columbia in the land or naval
12 forces of the United States shall be placed in a reserve status
13 on inactive duty, for the purpose of permitting such indi-
14 vidual to engage in the production of any agricultural com-
15 modity, until January 1, 1944, or until the date on which
16 such individual ceases to be engaged in any capacity in the
17 production of any such commodity, whichever first occurs.

18 SEC. 3. (a) Any individual engaged in producing any
19 agricultural commodity who is unable to plant, cultivate, or
20 harvest all or any part of his crop of any such commodity
21 on account of a shortage of farm labor may apply to the
22 agricultural extension agent of the county in which such
23 individual resides (or, if such county has no such agent, to
24 any such agent) for aid in planting, cultivating, or harvesting
25 such crop. If the agricultural extension agent to whom an

1 application is made under this section determines that in-
2 sufficient civilian labor is available to plant, cultivate, or
3 harvest such crop without material damage to such crop, he
4 shall notify the commanding officer of the nearest military
5 or naval post, camp, or station of such determination and
6 shall state the number of men needed in addition to the avail-
7 able civilian labor and the approximate time required to
8 plant, cultivate, or harvest such crop. Such commanding
9 officer shall detail immediately the number of men specified
10 under the command of a noncommissioned officer to perform
11 such service as may be necessary to plant, cultivate, or har-
12 vest such crop and shall provide for the transportation of the
13 men so detailed to and from the place where such service
14 is to be performed.

15 (b) Every individual receiving aid under subsection
16 (a) shall pay to the United States an amount equal to the
17 amount he would be required to pay for such service at the
18 prevailing rate of pay for such service in the community
19 in which such service is performed. All sums paid to the
20 United States under this subsection shall be covered into
21 the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

22 SEC. 4. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the
23 Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of
24 Selective Service each shall promulgate such regulations as
25 may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

78th CONGRESS
1st Session

H. R. 1728

A BILL

To increase the supply of farm labor during the calendar year 1943.

By Mr. Fulmer

February 5, 1943
Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 680

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 8, 1943

Mr. BUSHFIELD introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs

A BILL

To provide needed manpower for the production, conservation, and protection of food during the year 1943.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That to meet the existing necessity for labor in promoting, protecting, and conserving the production of food during the year 1943, the Secretary of War, with the advice and cooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture, shall upon the request of the Governor of any of the several States within the food-producing area of the United States in which the necessity therefor is certified by such governor grant furloughs to a sufficient number of men in the armed services

1 within the territorial limits of the continental United States
2 to meet such labor requirements.

3 SEC. 2. Such furloughs shall be granted to men in the
4 armed services for periods of from one to six months at
5 the discretion of the Secretary of War. Such furloughs
6 may be granted either to individuals or to groups of men
7 under military supervision for the purpose of tending, caring
8 for, and providing for livestock on the farms and ranches in
9 the States from which such requests are submitted, and
10 for the further purpose of planting, tending, harvesting, and
11 marketing the food crops of such States during the present
12 year.

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 680

A BILL

To provide needed manpower for the production, conservation, and protection of food during the year 1943.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD

FEBRUARY 8, 1943

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs

FARM LABOR PROGRAM, 1943

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON THE

APPROPRIATION FOR THE
FARM LABOR PROGRAM, CALENDAR YEAR 1943

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1943

83608

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, *Chairman*

CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, Virginia
LOUIS LUDLOW, Indiana
MALCOLM C. TARVER, Georgia
JED JOHNSON, Oklahoma
J. BUELL SNYDER, Pennsylvania
EMMET O'NEAL, Kentucky
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK, New York
LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan
JOE STARNES, Alabama
JOHN H. KERR, North Carolina
GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas
HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California
BUTLER B. HARE, South Carolina
ALBERT THOMAS, Texas
JOE HENDRICKS, Florida
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
JOHN M. COFFEE, Washington
W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas
ALBERT GORE, Tennessee
ELMER H. WENE, New Jersey
CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi
THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois
JAMES M. CURLEY, Massachusetts

JOHN TABER, New York
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts
WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON, Kansas
D. LANE POWERS, New Jersey
J. WILLIAM DITTER, Pennsylvania
ALBERT E. CARTER, California
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Vermont
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Illinois
ALBERT J. ENGEL, Michigan
KARL STEFAN, Nebraska
FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota
FRANK B. KEEFE, Wisconsin
NOBLE J. JOHNSON, Indiana
ROBERT F. JONES, Ohio
BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa
H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota
HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho
WALTER C. PLOESER, Missouri

MARCELLUS C. SHEILD, *Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFICIENCIES

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, *Chairman*

CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, Virginia
LOUIS LUDLOW, Indiana
J. BUELL SNYDER, Pennsylvania
EMMET O'NEAL, Kentucky
LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan
JED JOHNSON, Oklahoma

JOHN TABER, New York
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts
WILLIAM P .LAMBERTSON, Kansas
J. WILLIAM DITTER, Pennsylvania

FARM LABOR PROGRAM, 1943

HEARINGS CONDUCTED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN CHARGE OF DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, MESSRS. CLARENCE CANNON (CHAIRMAN), CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, LOUIS LUDLOW, J. BUELL SNYDER, EMMET O'NEAL, LOUIS C. RABAUT, JED JOHNSON, JOHN TABER, RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON, AND J. WILLIAM DITTER, ON THE DAYS FOLLOWING, NAMELY:

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1943.

FARM LABOR PROGRAM

STATEMENTS OF HON. CLAUDE R. WICKARD, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE; J. O. WALKER, CHIEF, AGRICULTURAL LABOR BRANCH, FOOD PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION; R. LYLE WEBSTER, ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE; M. CLIFFORD TOWNSEND, ADMINISTRATOR, FOOD PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION; MEREDITH C. WILSON, CHIEF, DIVISION OF FIELD STUDIES AND TRAINING, EXTENSION SERVICE; MILTON P. SIEGEL, CHIEF FISCAL OFFICER, FOOD PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION; DAN. M. BRAUM, SENIOR TRAINING SPECIALIST, OFFICE OF PERSONNEL; AND RICHARD W. MAYCOCK, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

RECRUITING, PLACEMENT, TRANSPORTATION, ETC.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, we have before us an estimate in House Document No. 106, in the amount of $65,075,000, for the farm-labor program, in an item which is as follows:

For expenses necessary for the formulation, development, and execution, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and either independently or in cooperation with individuals or agencies, public or private, of a plan to assist in providing an adequate supply and distribution of labor, including sharecroppers and tenants (including aliens), for the production of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, including (1) recruiting, placement, and transportation of such labor within the continental United States and elsewhere, including transportation of their families and household effects; (2) furnishing, by loans, grants, or otherwise, of medical services, training, subsistence, and shelter; (3) construction or lease and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and

services; (4) employment of persons (including aliens) and organizations, by contract or otherwise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (5) purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; (6) printing and binding; (7) acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; and (8) travel expenses of persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating capacities from a foreign country to the United States and return, including such expenses to first-duty stations, fiscal year 1943, $65,075,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943: *Provided*, That expenditures may be made hereunder without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That whenever labor shall be furnished hereunder to any other agency, public or private, or individual, this appropriation shall be reimbursed for expenditures on account of wages paid to such labor and other expenditures in connection therewith to the extent which the Secretary may determine to be practicable: *Provided further*, That effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3 of the Act of June 29, 1936 (40 U. S. C. 433), receipts derived for the account of the United States from the use and occupancy of labor supply centers, including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That transfers may be made, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, from this appropriation to any bureau or office of the Department of Agriculture, or to any other agency of the Government, which is assigned functions in connection herewith, in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944: *Provided further*, That any payments made by the United States or private employers to aliens under this program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code $65,075,000

The CHAIRMAN. We should be glad to have a statement from you on this item, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary WICKARD. As I have so often stated to congressional committees, I regard the farm labor problem as the most difficult one facing us in meeting the food-production goals for 1943. We feel that we must take every step to meet that problem, out of available labor, as efficiently as we possibly can.

This supplemental appropriation is designed to meet a part of the farm-labor problem, particularly the transportation of farm labor and the training of farm labor for work in 1943.

TRANSPORTATION OF FARM WORKERS

The greater part of the funds that are asked for in this budget message will be devoted to the transportation of farm workers.

We have thus far used funds made available to us from the President's emergency fund for transporting the farm workers, including Mexican workers as well as domestic workers.

We feel that we have proven, not only this year but in years past, that it was the proper thing to do, to transport farm workers from one section to the other in order that their labor be more fully utilized.

In the months that lie ahead we feel that we should not let farm workers remain idle any more days than necessary. The only way to avoid that is to transfer them from one section to the other as the needs arise, for planting and cultivating and harvesting of crops.

We are planning to bring in several thousand more Mexican laborers, especially for the Southwest; California, Arizona, and other areas also, for sugar-beet and other production.

We are planning and have now already moved farm workers to Florida for the harvesting of fruits, and the planting of crops in that area. We know as the spring season opens up that there will be increasing demands for us to transport workers to areas where there is a deficit of labor.

Mr. TABER. Where do you propose to get them and where do you propose to take them?

Secretary WICKARD. We propose to get them wherever they can be recruited. We are getting workers for Florida, I believe for the most part, in some of the surrounding States; Tennessee, I believe, and Mississippi.

Mr. TABER. I would like to have you tell us who is going to have charge of this, in your Department?

Secretary WICKARD. The Farm Security Administration will do the transportation as they have in the past.

RECRUITMENT OF VOLUNTEER WORKERS

The greatest number of people that will be affected, perhaps, by this appropriation, will be the number that we can enlist in the towns and the cities and the villages nearby, where the need for workers will occur.

We are planning, through the Extension Service, to carry on recruitment of volunteer workers who will be paid, of course, the usual wage, but who will be willing to do this type of work, even though it may mean departing from their usual civilian activities.

They are going to appeal to the school people, the church people, and to the service clubs, chambers of commerce, and all those organizations, to help them in this mobilization.

As a matter of fact, they have already made their plans. We have had conferences here in Washington and I believe the State directors of extention in every State are actively engaged in laying their plans for this type of work. Also, the Extension Service and the colleges will help us in training workers, giving them short training for whatever work and in whatever time conditions will permit. This training will all, I believe, be in cooperation with the Office of Education.

That is about all I have to say, except again to repeat the urgency of this appropriation in order that we can meet the acute farm labor problem that is developing.

SHORTAGE OF FARM LABOR

The CHAIRMAN. What is the farm labor situation today as compared with that of a year ago, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary WICKARD. There are less workers on the farms today.

The CHAIRMAN. How many less?

Secretary WICKARD. I believe about 200,000. That is as of February 1, compared with any other year of which we have records.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that distributed generally all over the country, or is it localized?

Secretary WICKARD. I should say it was pretty generally distributed.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is really more acute near the war industries.

Secretary WICKARD. The worst thing about that, Mr. Chairman, is that it is not just the total number, that is, the difference between what we have now and what we usually have. Now we are dipping

into the number of people who stay on farms the year round and who are better-trained people. I am not talking about the number of people who are known as seasonal workers, but the year-round type of labor, which are included in these numbers. That is the alarming part of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. There you are striking at the crux of the situation; you are putting your finger right on the point, Mr. Secretary. The remedy for this is not to take key men from the farms, in the draft. No man who is essential to farm labor should be taken off the farm. He is more valuable behind the plow than behind the machine gun, when other men can handle the machine gun, who cannot handle the plow. I believe you will agree it takes considerable training to qualify a man for labor on the farm, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary WICKARD. Of course, it depends on the type of farm labor, but for the year-round management of farms, it takes a lifetime of experience, and then you never learn everything, as I have found out.

The CHAIRMAN. And the man who enjoys farming and wants to stay there, and is accustomed to rural life, is the man to keep on the farm?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, we cannot take a man off the farm who has been trained all of his life to farm work, whose interest is there, and whose future is there, and put him in the Army; and then put in his place a ribbon salesman, or a soda clerk, and expect the same amount of production.

Secretary WICKARD. Especially on livestock farms, places like that, where you have to have long experience and training.

METHODS FOR KEEPING EXPERIENCED FARM LABOR ON THE FARMS

The CHAIRMAN. What has been done to keep the men on the farm who ought to be kept there?

Secretary WICKARD. The first specific action was taken by the War Manpower Commission after I requested that specific action be taken to defer the essential farm workers on livestock, dairy, and poultry farms. I believe that action was taken in September or October of last year. A few months later Senator Tydings offered his amendment, which was adopted, under which we worked out a plan for classifying essential farm workers into separate classes. The single farm workers now are put into 2–C. The men with dependents are put into 3–C. The greatest advantage of that, outside of actually deferring those men, giving them a preferential treatment which no other industry has, is to change, as I understand it, the quota for an agricultural county, which ordinarily is built upon the number of men in class 1–A.

ACTION OF DRAFT BOARDS AFFECTING FARM LABOR

The CHAIRMAN. Notwithstanding the action which you have taken to keep labor on the farm, to exempt farm laborers from the draft, in certain classes of essential farming, our reports from the field are that local draft boards are paying no attention to those directives; that they continue to take essential men from farms producing livestock, poultry, and dairy products vitally needed in the war program.

Within the last week they have taken out of my own county men whose absence from the farm means a reduced production of vital food products this crop year. While you have given them every opportunity to exempt needed farm labor, they are not exempting it.

Secretary WICKARD. I believe under the law these local boards are autonomous, are they not? Did not Congress provide that in the law?

The CHAIRMAN. That is true, and we are faced with a critical situation in which they are still taking them from the farms.

Secretary WICKARD. That is too bad, and I regret very much to hear it. I do not know what all the instructions have been, but those that we have seen are very specific on how they should leave these people on the farm.

Here is what we are up against. Some of these draft boards say that they have to choose between taking a man with dependents, or a single man working on a farm. It puts them in a pretty uncomfortable position.

Mr. TABER. Some of those local draft boards have been construing these instructions rather liberally, as far as farmers are concerned, and some of them have been construing them the other way. That is correct, is it not?

Secretary WICKARD. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. I get that in my own district. Some of them do very well and some of them do not. Your trouble is with your local boards. Whether the appeal boards are any better, I do not know. I have not found that they were, as yet.

The CHAIRMAN. They should give them less latitude.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION'S DIRECTIVE CONCERNING FARM LABOR

The CHAIRMAN. Will you put into the record at this point, Mr. Secretary, the directive authorizing you to take over this work and in that connection distinguish between your jurisdiction and the jurisdiction of Mr. McNutt's organization?

Secretary WICKARD. That directive I have from Mr. McNutt's organization. I have the text of it right here. Do you want me to read it?

The CHAIRMAN. We will insert it verbatim in the record at this point, and you may give us orally the gist of it.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

(Directive XVII)

FARM LABOR MOBILIZATION RESPONSIBILITIES IN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

By virtue of the authority vested in me by Executive Orders Nos. 9139 and 9279, and having found, after consultation with the members of the War Manpower Commisison, that the measures hereinafter set forth will promote a more effective mobilization and utilization of the farm labor resources in the prosecution of the war through a more complete use of the facilities and personnel of the Department of Agriculture, it is hereby directed:

I. The Secretary of Agriculture, through such persons and employees (including uncompensated personnel) of the Department of Agriculture as he may designate and subject to policies and standards prescribed by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, and to the continuous review and appraisal of the War Manpower Commission, shall have full operating responsibility for the recruitment, placement, transfer, and utilization of agricultural workers, to the end that the labor requirements of agricultural production may be met.

II. In carrying out responsibilities in connection with the mobilization of farm labor, the Department of Agriculture will recruit, place, and transfer workers already engaged in agriculture, and youth, women and other workers not already engaged in agriculture, in order that agricultural production schedules may be met.

III. The Department of Agriculture in its recruitment, placement, transfer, and utilization of workers will cooperate closely with the United States Employment Service, in order that the total labor requirements for agricultural and other production will be served as efficiently as possible from a common labor pool. In those instances where the number of workers in agriculture and in rural communities is inadequate to meet the labor requirements for agricultural production, the Department of Agriculture may place orders for additional workers with the United States Employment Service. In those instances where the facilities of the United States Employment Service are used for the recruitment of agricultural workers, appropriate certifications as to the labor supply and demand will be made by the Department of Agriculture. The importation of foreign workers for use in agriculture will be initiated only with the approval, and in accord with the policies, of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and only after all local resources are exhausted.

IV. The Secretary of Agriculture shall make such reports concerning agricultural labor requirements, the supply of workers available for agricultural work, and the Department's recruitment, placement, transfer, and utilization operations under this directive, as the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission may from time to time require, for an appraisal of the agricultural labor mobilization program and for the purpose of coordinating this program with other parts of the manpower mobilization program.

V. As used in this directive, the term "agricultural" means those farm activities or services carried on by, or performed for, farm owners or tenants on farms in connection with the cultivation of the soil, the harvesting of crops, or the raising, feeding, or management of livestock, bees, and poultry, and shall not include any packing, canning, processing, transportation, or marketing of articles produced on farms unless performed or carried on as an incident to ordinary farming operations as distinguished from manufacturing or commercial operations.

PAUL V. MCNUTT, *Chairman.*

JANUARY 23, 1943.

Secretary WICKARD. This simply gives to the Department of Agriculture the entire responsibility for supplying the labor for farms. We are to work, however, with the Employment Services in certain fields; with the Office of Education in training; and any other agency that may be useful in getting and training the number of people needed on the farms. But as I said a while ago, it gives us the direct responsibility for this type of work, as I explained in my opening statement.

SOURCES FOR RECRUITMENT OF FARM LABOR

(See p. 40)

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you expect to get this labor?

Secretary WICKARD. Every place we can possibly get it.

The CHAIRMAN. What specific reservoir of labor do you have in mind from which this labor can be drawn?

Secretary WICKARD. As I said a while ago, the largest numbers will be recruited from towns and villages and cities of this country. We have always had about 3½ million more people working on farms in September and October than we have had in January. Those are the seasonal type of workers who do not work on farms the year round, but upon whom we have to rely to get out crops harvested.

The CHAIRMAN. Why do you think they are still available, when all other manpower sources in the country are being rapidly dried up?

Secretary WICKARD. It is a great question, Mr. Chairman, as to whether these people are still available, because, as you well know, not only have we taken large numbers since last fall, when we had about 12,000,000 on the farms, but we are still going to continue to

take them during the remainder of this winter and spring; and whether we will find those same workers who have helped us in the past, of course, is a matter of conjecture. I am afraid we will not find the same workers. We are going to have to get new people to help in all industries, including agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. How many do you expect to get?

Secretary WICKARD. For the seasonal type of work, I should say we ought to have at lest 3½ million, and I prefer to put our estimates higher, because of two things. First, our agricultural production goals for next year are again higher than they were last year, and very probably the output per worker will not be as high as it was last year because some of the men, some of the more competent men, have gone into other work or into the Army.

IMPORTATION OF MEXICAN WORKERS

The CHAIRMAN. Of these three and a half million, how many will be foreign and how many will be domestic?

Secretary WICKARD. We hope we can get about 50,000 from Mexico. Ambassador Messersmith thought we could go that high if we are able to arrange for transportation and other problems. We have to recruit them, examine them, and transport them.

INDUCEMENTS TO GET FARM WORKERS

The CHAIRMAN. In your opening statement, Mr. Secretary, you said you expected to appeal to these people and I do not remember your exact words, but to the effect that out of their patriotic desire to serve the country, you expected to get them to volunteer for farm work.

As a matter of fact, you know we must recognize that there is no appeal to this class of labor which would mean anything unless buttressed by two prerequisites; first, ample pecuniary inducement. Your wages must be sufficient to attract them. And secondly, they must be willing to go on the farm and do farm labor under average farm conditions.

Now, as to the first requirement: What do you propose to offer them in the way of wages in order to take them out of the city, where they prefer to stay, and have been staying? How much will it be necessary to offer in order to bring them to the farm?

Mr. WICKARD. There are two types. I want to make that clear so that we do not get confused between the two types. As I said a while ago, we are going to appeal to a lot of people who ordinarily would not work on farms, who are not going to work on farms for just the financial return, but who will do it maybe a week or two weeks or three weeks; sometimes by closing down the schools or the business houses. That is the way California was able to harvest the greatest crops that they ever had, last year, despite the fact that we moved out the Japs and they had to depend upon business houses closing down and schools closing down, and we are going to have to do a lot more of that this year. If you do not appeal to people, or cannot appeal to people, Mr. Chairman, on the question of wages that you are going to offer them, you must appeal to them on saving the crop. That is one type.

The CHAIRMAN. That class of people would necessarily be local people.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; that is one type. As I said, those were the people we would appeal to; we would appeal to their patriotism more than we would appeal to them on the basis of the amount of money that they would receive.

The second class—the one which I think you were referring to—presents this problem: What are we going to pay those people who are looking for work, such as Mexicans or people who live in Tennessee, for instance, and whom we are now transporting to Florida? We say that we will give them a minimum of $3 a day or the going wage in that community, whichever is higher. We are making that promise before we transport them.

The CHAIRMAN. Nothing is said about the maximum?

Secretary WICKARD. No.

The CHAIRMAN. And no assurance is given the employer as to range of wages?

Secretary WICKARD. No.

AVERAGE COST OF TRANSPORTATION PER WORKER

The CHAIRMAN. What will be the average cost of transportation per worker?

Secretary WICKARD. What is our estimated cost for seasonal workers—Mexicans as well as domestics?

Major WALKER. It will average approximately $50.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that for a round trip or merely to the place of employment?

Major WALKER. That is the round trip.

MINIMUM HOUSING REQUIREMENTS FOR WORKERS

The CHAIRMAN. These people have to be housed and fed. What about their subsistence and housing of these people?

Secretary WICKARD. We ask the local authorities to provide the best housing obtainable for them.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any minimum requirements as to housing?

Secretary WICKARD. None, except that they get protection from the standpoint of health and sanitation. Sanitation, of course, must be provided.

The CHAIRMAN. Something was said when importations of labor was under discussion, about minimum housing requirements.

Secretary WICKARD. Would you want Major Walker to state exactly what the housing requirements are?

The CHAIRMAN. Please put them in the record at this point.

Major WALKER. Housing requirements are as follows: (1) That shelters are weather-proof, (2) that pure water is available for drinking purposes, (3) that proper provisions are made for disposal of waste material, (4) that sanitary privies are available, (5) that water is available for laundry and bathing, (6) that shelters are not over-crowded (generally not to exceed four persons per shelter).

IMPORTATION OF MEXICAN WORKERS

The CHAIRMAN. What success have you had with the importation of Mexican labor?

Secretary WICKARD. It has worked out very well. I went to Mexico City and negotiated for the transportation of Mexican labor last June and July. When I arrived there, I found that there was much opposition because of previous experience the Mexican Government had had with a large number of Mexicans who were left stranded in this country. They were brought up here for sugar-beet harvest for a few weeks, and then could not get back. They said they had to spend a lot of money to get them back, especially during the depression.

They also said that they were promised one kind of wage or another, and when they got up here they were left to the mercy of the employer. They did not have any housing. They were left on ditch banks and in other places.

So we had to give them some assurances not only as to the transportation to this country, but return to Mexico. We had to tell them what the minimum wages would be and how long they would be employed during the time they were here.

I told them we would do the best we could so far as housing was concerned. One other thing that was agreed to was a small reserve to be set aside to give to these people out of their wages when they returned to Mexico so that they would not immediately become charges on the Mexican Government.

What we have done is to try to get, so far as practicable, and possible, agricultural people, farm people.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you leave that, what guaranty are you able to give the Mexican Government that these agreements will be carried out?

Secretary WICKARD. Before we bring them over, we enter into an agreement with the Mexican Government through the Farm Security Administration, that these guaranties will be met.

The CHAIRMAN. How adaptable is that class of labor to livestock farming and to year-round employment, say in Corn Belt agriculture?

Secretary WICKARD. I do not think it would be so adaptable to Corn-Belt conditions, but in the Southwest we have used them almost continuously since they have been here on sugar beets, and vegetable and fruit farming. We have not used them in livestock, so far as I know, although there is some talk of trying to train them for sheep herders. Perhaps it would require some training. We have lost a great many sheep herders and it has cut down the number of people on the ranches, and is a very serious condition.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be year-round farming?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; but I do not think we put any into the Corn Belt, except some to work in the sugar-beet fields.

The CHAIRMAN. The 50,000 you propose to bring from Mexico, even if you reach that number, would be a drop in the bucket so far as your requirements are concerned which you say aggregate three and a half million workers. Where do you propose to get the rest of them and where do you plan to get the labor that will take care of the situation in the Corn Belt, for example, or in the dairy industry in the Northern States?

PERCENTAGES OF FARM LABOR GOING INTO INDUSTRY AND ARMED FORCES

Secretary WICKARD. That is one of the difficult problems, getting people to work on the dairy farms.

Mr. TABER. What you need to do is what I suggested off the record before. You must stop taking farm help for these Government construction projects. They have taken men from the farm territory in central New York in number four times over the draft, and I think you will find that they have taken three times as many all over the country.

Secretary WICKARD. Our figures show that 40 percent of the men who have left the farms have gone into the Army and 60 percent into industry.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is the year-around.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Mr. TABER. You have got to stop the Army and the Navy from taking those men on those projects, if you want to get relief.

Secretary WICKARD. I should like to make this remark. You asked what can be done. The men who leave the farms to work in industry are subject to reclassification now into I–A, if they do not get permission from ther local draft boards. That step has been taken.

Mr. TABER. That helps but it does not affect those below and above certain ages.

Secretary WICKARD. No; but I do not know how we are going to avoid that as long as there is a great disparity, such as there is, between farm wages and wages in these industries. I do not know how are we going to remove that temptation, except that there are a lot of people who would rather work on farms than in cities.

FUNDS EXPENDED AND OBLIGATED TO DATE FOR FARM MANPOWER

The CHAIRMAN. What has been done on this program up to this time? What steps have already been taken?

Secretary WICKARD. We already are using the President's emergency fund and have been using it for the past several months.

The CHAIRMAN. In what amounts?

Secretary WICKARD. $4,500,000 has been allocated to us but it has not all been obligated.

The CHAIRMAN. How much has been obligated up to February 1?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Up to February 1 the obligations were $1,507,220.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you give us a break-down of that, tell us how much has been actually spent. What commitments have been made in addition to that?

Mr. MAYCOCK. In excess of that?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Secretary WICKARD. The total is approximately $3,500,000, including the $1,507,220 already referred to. In other words, obligations and commitments total approximately $3,500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Give us the allocations covering expenditures and commitments aggregating $4,500,000. You might make a tabulation containing three columns; the amount allocated; the amount actually spent; and the amount that has been abligated.

Mr. TABER. Over what period?

The CHAIRMAN. When did you first secure this money?

Secretary WICKARD. The first workers were transported in September.

The CHAIRMAN. These figures would cover September 1 to February 1.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

Status of allotment from Emergency fund for the President from beginning of program to Jan. 31, 1943

	Estimated allocations	Obligations	Expenditures [1]
Farm labor transportation:			
Transportation, subsistence, and medical care:			
(a) Seasonal labor	$2,374,338	$1,274,231	$80,516
(b) Year round labor	1,250,000	35,630	5,995
(c) Supervision	739,001	163,379	92,032
Administration	136,661	33,980	11,291
Total	4,500,000	1,507,220	189,834

[1] Railroad tickets not paid until round trip completed.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us to what projects this $4,500,000 has been allocated.

Mr. MAYCOCK. It has all been for transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. How has the overhead been handled, Mr. Secretary? What about paying those in charge of the program? Where have the expenses been paid for that purpose?

Mr. SIEGEL. Out of the same fund.

The CHAIRMAN. Out of the $4,500,000? Mr. Maycock said it had all been allocated to transportation.

Secretary WICKARD. He did not mean just the purchase of railroad tickets. He means transportation activities including administrative and supervisory expenses.

Mr. MAYCOCK. I meant for all expenses incidental to the transportation project, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you break that down into personnel expense and disbursements for actual transportation. That is, give us the number on your staff, the number of personnel; the number transported; and what transportation projects you have put through.

What groups have been transported, from where, and to what point?

Mr. SIEGEL. The obligations by object of expenditure are as follows:

Personal services	$90,355
Travel	84,295
Transportation of things	150
Communication services	11,050
Rents and utilities	1,309
Supplies and materials	10,200
Subsistence en route	232,011
Subsistence and medical care in employment area	36,029
Transportation	1,041,821
Total obligations to Jan. 31, 1943	1,507,220
Number of personnel employed under "Emergency fund for the President"	291

The moves of agricultural workers which have been accomplished under this program up to February 18, 1943, are as follows:

From—	To—	Number of persons transported	Crops
Virginia	New York	123	Tomatoes, carrots, beets, beans, peaches, and apples.
Ohio	do	49	
West Virginia	do	310	
Kentucky	do	178	
Do	do	176	
Do	Michigan	730	Sugar beets.
Do	New Jersey	312	Tomatoes, miscellaneous vegetables (cannery work).
Do	Connecticut	208	Potatoes and miscellaneous vegetables.
Illinois	Washington	661	Fruit.
Mexico	California	[1] 5,314	Sugar beets, cotton, vegetables, citrus, and guayule.
Texas	Arizona	520	Long-staple cotton.
Do	New Mexico	134	Do.
Missouri	California	631	Long-staple cotton and vegetables.
Do	Arizona	1,237	Long-staple cotton.
Tennessee	do	140	Do.
New Jersey	Florida	75	Vegetables, sugarcane, and citrus fruits.
North Carolina	do	105	Do.
Tennessee	do	1,203	Do.
Do	New Mexico	185	Long-staple cotton.
Do	Texas	223	Do.
Mississippi	Florida	422	Vegetables, sugarcane, and citrus fruits.
Georgia	do	22	Do.
Louisiana	do	114	Do.
Alabama	do	65	Do.
Total		13,137	

[1] As of Feb. 1, 1943.

FARM LABOR HERETOFORE TRANSPORTED—IMPORTATION OF MEXICAN LABOR

(See p. 9, 17)

The CHAIRMAN. Generally speaking, where have you taken these laborers from? The first group, I take for granted, were taken from Mexico. Where were they taken to?

Major WALKER. The first group was taken from Virginia to New York; the number was 123.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us something about that project. One hundred and twenty-three persons were taken from what part of Virginia?

Major WALKER. They were taken from down in the vicinity of Danville, Va.

The CHAIRMAN. How were they recruited? Did you advertise for them, or take people who were on a waiting list; or how?

Major WALKER. They were recruited entirely through the Employment Service. At that time, and until this new directive to the secretary, the recruitment was all through the Employment Service.

The CHAIRMAN. To what points were they delivered in New York?

Major WALKER. I do not remember the county; it was in up-State New York.

The CHAIRMAN. What work did they do?

Major WALKER. They worked on tomatoes, beans, peaches, and apples.

Mr. TABER. Port Byron, Genoa, and Savannah were three of them.

The CHAIRMAN. How long were they employed?

Major WALKER. I do not have that information with me.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they still there?

Major WALKER. No, sir; they have gone back.

The CHAIRMAN. What success did you have with that experiment?

Major WALKER. Our information is that it went quite well. The large percentage of the growers and farmers were very well satisfied with them and have expressed a great desire that we conduct something of the same kind again this year. There were cases that were not good.

The CHAIRMAN. They have put in an application for additional help?

Major WALKER. They have not actually put in applications, but they have indicated that they will do so.

The CHAIRMAN. What character of labor?

Major WALKER. This was nearly all that had had farm experience of some kind. In that first group some that were not so good came from cities. But the larger percentage of them had had farm experience and farm background of some kind.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you pay them?

Major WALKER. Altogether?

The CHAIRMAN. No; per day, per man.

Major WALKER. I would have to get that information for you; I do not remember.

The CHAIRMAN. Our information is that quite a number of them were physically unfit and had to be hospitalized and that a material number of them were in the guardhouse the next Saturday night after they got there.

Have you any information on that?

Major WALKER. No; I have not. I never heard that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. But you have not received formal application for their reemployment in the places where they formerly worked.

Major WALKER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your next project?

Major WALKER. The next is the Mexicans, probably the first 3,000, that were moved into California.

The CHAIRMAN. Were they all moved at once?

Major WALKER. It was a continuous movement.

The CHAIRMAN. Over what period were those 3,000 moved?

Major WALKER. We can move at the present time, with the Mexican railways, 500 to 600 every 5 days, so it took practically a month, or a little better, to get those 3,000 in.

The CHAIRMAN. To what localities and what activities?

Major WALKER. They went into the sugar-beet industry. The first ones went to the vicinity of Stockton and Sacramento. Then there were others who went to other parts of the sugar-beet area in that general section of California.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the date of their arrival?

Major WALKER. I do not remember.

The CHAIRMAN. You may supply that information.

How long were they retained?

(The information may be found on p. 20.)

Major WALKER. Some of them are still there.

The CHAIRMAN. What percentage are still there?

Major WALKER. May I tell you exactly what happened with them?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, please.

Major WALKER. Of the 3,000 about 120 were sent back as being incompetent.

The CHAIRMAN. Who bore the expense of their transportation up and back?

Major WALKER. The Government did.

The CHAIRMAN. Could they have been weeded out before they were delivered?

Major WALKER. An effort was made to do that. They were all examined physically. There was a representative there from the sugar-beet growers who assisted in the selection. About four out of every five who were examined were rejected for physical or for some other reasons. A great effort was made to keep to a minimum the workers that were not satisfactory. Two hundred and fifty of them were not good workers in sugar beets. Sugar beets is pretty heavy work. Apparently these people were good workers otherwise. They were shifted over to working on the guayule-rubber project in that area.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a Government project?

Major WALKER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Government was less exacting than the private employers?

Major WALKER. No; the work was lighter. Sugar-beet work is pretty heavy work and these men were able to do the lighter work very satisfactorily.

The original contract expired on the 15th of December and 1,200 of them exercised their rights under the contract and went home at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are there now?

Major WALKER. About 1,800 of that original group.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they all employed today and what wages are they receiving?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir; they are all employed. They started out in the sugar-beet industry and they received the prevailing wages being paid in sugar beets at that time which I think was 65 cents an hour.

Secretary WICKARD. That is right.

Major WALKER. Then they were shifted down, most of them, into the citrus area, at the time their work was finished there. I do not remember what their hourly wages were.

The CHAIRMAN. The question of housing and clothing there is a minor problem because the weather is moderate?

Major WALKER. Most of the growers there have housing.

The CHAIRMAN. But it is not as serious a problem as it would be in the north?

Major WALKER. No, sir; it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. And the fact that they were successful, the 1,800 of them who remained, does not mean that they could remain without additional provisions both for housing and clothing, if they were to work in a more severe climate.

For instance, if they were sent to Michigan or Minnesota, or North or South Dakota; Iowa, or Missouri, under weather we are experiencing at the present time, the problem of housing and clothing would become complicated?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir; it would be.

The CHAIRMAN. While there are some who would be adaptable to that climate, they would not be adaptable to all climates in the United States.

How many did you first import?

Major WALKER. 3,052.

The CHAIRMAN. And you saved about half of them; about half stayed on the job. Now, couldn't private employment have done a little better? Wouldn't they have had more than a 50 percent residue of effective workers if they had gone down and brought them in? What did the Government do that private employers could not have done?

Major WALKER. They are recruiting for additional Mexicans down there now, and the interesting part of it is that nearly all of these who went home want to come back. They were early applicants to be returned. Apparently what happened was this. Their contracts had expired and they saw a good chance to go home for Christmas, and they took advantage of it. The contracts that we are making now run for a period of a year; they can be kept for not exceeding a year before going back, if they are needed.

The CHAIRMAN. These men who are being drafted, if they were on the farm, would want to stay there over Christmas.

Secretary WICKARD. May I make one remark, Mr. Chairman? There is no chance, I am informed by Ambassador Messersmith—which confirms information that I picked up and which I think Congressman Kleberg will also confirm—of private employers going to Mexico to get workers. There is no chance.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not mean so very much, anyway, when you get only 1,800 out of a needed three and a half million.

Secretary WICKARD. We can import more than that, but if you want to assume that is all we can get, very well.

The CHAIRMAN. I am going on the facts that you are giving us. If you have any further evidence on that, we shall be glad to hear it.

Secretary WICKARD. These were the first 3,000.

Major WALKER. You understand that the 1,200 completed their contract before they went back.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. We will go further into the matter by taking up your next project.

Major WALKER. I do not know whether these are in chronological order, but I can take them up as I have them on this list.

The CHAIRMAN. We would rather have them in chronological order, if you can give them to us in that way.

Major WALKER. We can furnish it to you in that way, but I do not think these are arranged in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the next one you have there?

Major WALKER. The next one was from Kentucky to Michigan. Seven hundred and thirty went there to work on sugar beets.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the date of their employment and the date of their discharge?

Major WALKER. I shall have to furnish that. I do not have the dates here.

The CHAIRMAN. Were they recruited through the Employment Office?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir; they were recruited in eastern Kentucky.

The CHAIRMAN. Who paid for the cost of their transportation?

Major WALKER. The Government.

The CHAIRMAN. And what wages were paid them?

Major WALKER. They were paid the prevailing wage in sugar beets, fixed at the time. I do not remember what that was.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you supply that for the record?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

(The information may be found on p. 20.)

Secretary WICKARD. We have to fix the wages on sugar-beet contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. You do fix them?

Secretary WICKARD. By law; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What wages do these men receive?

Secretary WICKARD. I believe we have a minimum of 30 cents, or the going wage, and I expect in this case the going wage was higher. I could not tell you what it is at this moment.

The CHAIRMAN. These men received an average of how much per day?

Secretary WICKARD. I could not tell you that now.

The CHAIRMAN. You will supply those figures?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

(The information may be found on p. 20.)

The CHAIRMAN. Also I would like to know how much it cost the employer; and how much it cost the United States, including the overhead of the agency which transported them.

Secretary WICKARD. You are talking about this Michigan contingent?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. What success did they have? What was the attitude of their employers as to their effectiveness at the close of their period of employment.

Major WALKER. The sugar-beet people told me that they were satisfied. They have had a great deal of difficulty on the wage situation up there, which has not been completely straightened out, because they ran into a long period of rain and freeze which was not conducive to continuing employment. These sugar-beet people have expressed the hope that we will be able to provide labor the same way this next year for shortages that they may have.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had actual applications?

Major WALKER. No; we have not. What we have been urging all of them to do is to follow their own methods and practices as far as they can. Now, the sugar-beet people in Michigan normally recruit their labor in Texas for sugar-beet work. They are getting that under way at the present time, although they are expecting us to provide extra labor over and above the number that they can get by their normal recruiting process in Texas.

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE RECRUITMENT OF LABOR

The CHAIRMAN. Why can't they do their own recruiting, and get more satisfactory employees by doing the recruiting for themselves? Of course, I understand that any company running a sugar-beet plant or otherwise employing large blocs of labor would be glad to have the Government supply free service to the company, but under the system

whereby all American industry takes care of its own expenses of employment, why couldn't those recruit their own labor down there?

Secretary WICKARD. There is nobody prohibiting them from doing it. We are faced with the necessity of either letting crops spoil or taking action when people appeal to us for help on account of the labor shortage.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they appeal to you to get this labor for them, or do you volunteer to furnish it to them?

Secretary WICKARD. They appeal to us.

The CHAIRMAN. They appeal to you to get it for them?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Because that saves them from sending their own men down there to recruit labor. If they had to recruit them themselves they would have to pay the cost of transportation. They at least save cost of transportation by letting you recruit them.

Secretary WICKARD. We had to meet this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you charge the transportation to them?

Secretary WICKARD. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Government just made a present of this transportation to the company?

Secretary WICKARD. We paid the transportation for persons recruited beyond the first 200 miles. I do not believe that you can expect any of the farmers to go down into Mexico or to go thousands of miles away to try to get workers to work on their farms.

The CHAIRMAN. But if you let part of those remain on the farm who wanted to stay there, and who now want to stay there, and who will stay there, this would not be necessary.

Secretary WICKARD. You say if I let part of them remain on the farm?

The CHAIRMAN. It would not be necessary to pay cost of transportation in order to get labor.

Secretary WICKARD. You will give me the authority to do that, will you? What law do you have that authorizes me to do it?

The CHAIRMAN. You are proposing a solution of the labor problem. Is this the best solution? We want men on the farms. Is this method you are suggesting an effective solution of the problem?

Secretary WICKARD. It is a stopgap. I hope that we do not find it necessary to transport, recruit, or train a single person, but I know that we are at war, and I know that we are going to have to do like every other nation which is at war—make the best use of the labor we have available.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask you this: Would it be a better plan to leave on the farm the men already there instead of drafting experienced farmers and later attempting to replace them?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the next project?

FARM LABOR HERETOFORE TRANSPORTED

Major WALKER. The next one was the movement of men from Kentucky into New Jersey, a movement of 312 persons to work in harvesting tomatoes and miscellaneous vegetables, and do cannery work. The reports on these workers were very satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. When were they employed, and when did they arrive?

Major WALKER. I will have to furnish that information in each case.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, in each case put in the record how many men remained through the season, and especially whether their employer has filed a request for their reemployment and a renewal of this service. The real criterion is what the employer thought of their work.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

(The information may be found on page 20.)

Major WALKER. One of the larger employers up there was the Seabrook Farms. Their man was in the office yesterday, and they are going to follow through the practice, as they did last year, of recruiting all of the labor that they can on their own, and they are expecting us to help out in providing supplemental labor that they are unable to get on their own, just as we did last year.

The CHAIRMAN. When they recruit them on their own do they pay the transportation?

Major WALKER. Yes; if they recruit them on their own they pay the transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. And you supply the transportation for those you furnish?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

Secretary WICKARD. Beyond the first 200 miles.

The CHAIRMAN. When you supply them with men are they under obligations to retain these men if they consider them unsatisfactory?

Major WALKER. They were last year in this particular case. We have agreed with most of them that if the labor appears to be unsatisfactory after a period of trial that is agreed upon that we will take them off of their hands and try to use them somewhere else, or return them to where they came from.

The CHAIRMAN. The whole proposition with them is that you will send in men for their inspection. If they like them they will keep them and the Government will pay for delivering the men to their door?

Major WALKER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. If they do not like them they will reject them without obligation and without cost. That is a very attractive arrangement. Any farmer would agree to a proposition like that. Send all of the men you like to my door. I will look them over, and if I want them I will keep them; if not, I will reject them with no expense to me, and all of the expense in either event is on the Government. Is that the proposition?

Major WALKER. That is about the proposition except they need labor so badly that the rejections have been nothing.

Secretary WICKARD. Before they get them there has to be a certification that there is a great shortage of labor in that area.

The CHAIRMAN. All of these areas to which labor has been transported are in specialized crops, with a peak labor problem.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But the labor that is really going to produce the food required by the country is all-round labor on livestock, dairy, poultry, and grain farms. What are you doing for that class of employer?

Major WALKER. All we have been talking about here so far are peak labor movements.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you take each project and supply the data you have been asked to give on these two projects, and let us have especially any indication as to the satisfaction, or dissatisfaction, the approval, or disapproval of such labor and the system on the part of the employer.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

Transportation of domestic and Mexican workers from inception to Feb. 18, 1943

From—	To—	Date transported	Date arrived	Total number of persons transported	Total number of workers transported	Crops	Wages paid
Virginia	New York	Sept. 4, 1942	Sept. 6, 1942	123	114	Apples, pears, potatoes, onions, carrots, tomatoes.	7 to 11 cents per bushel, apples; 35 to 50 cents per hour for all other crops.
Ohio	do	do	do	49	46	do	Do.
West Virginia	do	Sept. 6, 1942	Sept. 8, 1942	310	287	do	Do.
Kentucky	do	Sept. 8, 1942 Sept. 22, 1942	Sept. 10, 1942 Sept. 24, 1942	354	346	do	Do.
Do	Michigan	Oct. 15, 1942 Oct. 27, 1942	Oct. 17, 1942 Oct. 29, 1942	730	695	Sugar beets	55 cents per hour, day work; $1.05 to $1.75 per ton, topping.
Do	New Jersey	Sept. 22, 1942 Oct. 17, 1942	Sept. 24, 1942 Oct. 19, 1942	312	268	Potatoes, tomatoes, spinach, apples.	5 to 8 cents per bushel, apples; 75 to 50 cents per hour, day work.
Do	Connecticut	Sept. 22, 1942 Oct. 3, 1942	Sept. 24, 1942 Oct. 5, 1942	208	199	Potatoes, miscellaneous vegetables.	5 cents per bushel, potatoes; $4 per day, day work.
Illinois	Washington	Oct. 1, 1942 Oct. 2, 1942 Oct. 3, 1942	Oct. 4, 1942 Oct. 5, 1942 Oct. 6, 1942	661	656	Fruit	7 to 12 cents per box, apples; 60 to 80 cents per hour.
Mexico	California Arizona	Sept. 25, 1942	(1)	5,314	5,314	SXP (long staple) cotton, vegetables.	50 cents per hour, guayule; 50 cents per hour, citrus; $4 per 100 pounds, cotton; 30 to 90 cents per hour, hourly work; 6 to 12 cents per box, citrus.
Texas	do	Oct. 31, 1942 Nov. 3, 1942 Nov. 5, 1942 Nov. 27, 1942	Nov. 2, 1942 Nov. 5, 1942 Nov. 8, 1942 Nov. 30, 1942	520	402	SXP cotton, vegetables	$4 per 100 pounds, cotton.
Do	New Mexico	Nov. 6, 1942	Nov. 9, 1942	134	129	SXP cotton	Do.
Missouri	California	Nov. 13, 1942 Dec. 7, 1942	Nov. 16, 1942 Dec. 10, 1942	631	484	SXP cotton, vegetables	$4 per 100 pounds, cotton; 50 to 70 cents per hour, vegetables.
Do	Arizona	Nov. 13, 1942 Dec. 7, 1942 Dec. 25, 1942	Nov. 16, 1942 Dec. 10, 1942 Dec. 28, 1942	1,237	1,024	do	Do.
Tennessee	do	Nov. 13, 1942	Nov. 16, 1942	140	115	do	$4 per 100 pounds, cotton; 30 to 50 cents per hour, vegetables.
New Jersey	Florida	Dec. 1, 1942	Dec. 3, 1942	75	58	Beans, tomatoes, potatoes, celery, sugarcane, citrus fruits.	Day work, $3 to $4 per day; hourly work, 30 to 40 cents per hour; beans, 25 to 60 cents per hamper.
North Carolina	do	Dec. 8, 1942 Dec. 14, 1942	Dec. 10, 1942 Dec. 16, 1942	105	85	do	Do.
Tennessee	do	Dec. 9, 18, 21, 1942 Jan. 1, 5, 14, 29, 1943 Feb. 7, 12, 13, 1943	Dec. 11, 20, 23, 1942 Jan. 3, 7, 16, 31, 1943 Feb. 9, 14, 15, 1943	1,203	1,006	Beans, tomatoes, potatoes, celery, sugarcane, citrus fruits.	Cane, $2.70 per row, 81 cents to $1.35 per ton.
Do	New Mexico	Nov. 13, 25, 1942	Nov. 16, 28, 1942	185	176	SXP cotton	$4 per 100 pounds.
Do	Texas	Nov. 25, 1942	Nov. 28, 1942	223	220	do	Do.

Mississippi	Florida	Jan. 24, 1943 Feb. 4, 11, 1943	Jan. 26, 1943 Feb. 6, 13, 1943	422	318	Beans, tomatoes, potatoes, celery, sugarcane, citrus fruits.	Day work, $3 to $4 per day; hourly work, 30 to 40 cents per hour; beans, 25 to 60 cents per hamper; cane $2.70 per row, 18 cents to $1.35 per ton.
Georgia	do	Jan. 27, 1943	Jan. 28, 1943	22	22	do	Do.
Louisiana	do	Feb. 11, 1943	Feb. 13, 1943	114	96	do	Do.
Alabama	do	Jan. 31, 1943 Feb. 2, 1943	Feb. 2, 1943 Feb. 4, 1943	65	62	do	Do.
Total				13,137	12,102		

[1] Present.

Period of time employed.—80 to 90 percent of workers transported were employed from 75 to 100 percent of the contracted period. Employment periods varied from 30-day contracts to 120-day contracts which in many cases were renewed as the need required.

Number workers returned to place of recruitment.—Over 90 percent of workers (rate so far) have returned to their homes upon completion of the work period.

Nonworkers.—Although some persons (members of families) transported show as nonworkers, many worked at least part time. Contracts are not executed with persons under 18 years of age, nor with wives with children able to work only part time .

United States Department of Agriculture farm labor program—Cost to Jan. 31, 1943, of transporting seasonal laborers (excludes return trips in cases of workers who have not yet returned)

From	To area of employment	Number transported as of Feb. 15, 1943	Transportation	Subsistence, health protection, and medical care en route	Subsistence and medical care in employment area	Total
Virginia	New York	123	$3,383	$218		$3,601
Ohio	do	49	436	61		497
West Virginia	do	310	5,786	479		6,265
Kentucky	do	178	3,207	237		3,444
Do	do	176	4,414	524		4,938
Subsistence in employment area					$5,931	5,931
Total		836	17,226	1,519	5,931	24,676
Kentucky	Michigan	730	11,638	911		12,549
Subsistence in employment area					726	726
Total		730	11,638	911	726	13,275
Kentucky	New Jersey	312	7,011	802		7,813
Subsistence in employment area					38	38
Total		312	7,011	802	38	7,851
Kentucky	Connecticut	208	5,929	815		6,744
Subsistence in employment area					635	635
Total		208	5,929	815	635	7,379
Illinois	Washington	661	40,415	6,662		47,077
Subsistence in employment area					6,970	6,970
Total		661	40,415	6,662	6,970	54,047
Mexico		5,314	249,718	29,202		278,920
Subsistence in employment area					9,284	9,284
Total [1]		5,314	249,718	29,202	9,284	288,204
Texas	Arizona	520				
Missouri	do	1,237				
Tennessee	do	140				
Missouri	California	631				
Total [1]		2,528	121,713	20,630	0	142,343
Texas	New Mexico	134				
Tennessee	do	185				
Do	Texas	223				
Total [1]		542	20,286	4,955	4,222	29,463
New Jersey	Florida	75				
North Carolina	do	105				
Tennessee	do	1,082				
Mississippi	do	407				
Georgia	do	22				
Louisiana	do	100				
Total [1]		1,791	38,706	4,747	488	43,941

[1] Moves to area of employment recently completed. Final costs not yet available.

NOTE.—Supervisory and administrative expenses cannot be broken down by individual moves. Obligations therefor to Jan. 31, 1943, were as follows: Supervisory, $163,379; administrative, $33,980.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Raleigh, February 9, 1943.

Mr. VANCE E. SWIFT,
Farm Security Administration,
State College Station, Raleigh, N. C.

DEAR MR. SWIFT: I acted as secretary to a meeting of the potato committee of the North Carolina Farm Bureau Federation held in Raleigh, N. C., on January 26.

A resolution with reference to the establishment of labor camps was unanimously passed and reads as follows:

"Whereas the Government has asked farmers to increase Irish potato production 15 percent which will necessitate like increase in labor;

"Whereas the commercial-producing counties are located in defense areas, or in close proximity to same, which makes the farm labor situation more acute;

"Whereas the cost of labor and materials for constructing adequate housing facilities, even if we could secure priority, would be prohibitive to the average farmer;

"Whereas transient labor camps were erected in certain counties for the potato-harvesting season of 1942 and have since been removed;

"Whereas the transient labor camps erected in those counties during the 1942 harvesting season were of inestimable value to the farmers thereof; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the potato growers representing all commercial-producing counties, request that the Farm Security Administration reopen and operate transient labor camps for the harvesting of 1943 potato crop."

Yours very truly,

RANDAL B. ETHERIDGE,
Chief, Division of Markets.

[Telegram]

YUMA, ARIZ., *December 11, 1942.*

Hon. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture:

Your action in supplying farm labor from Mexico to the farmers of Yuma County during this most critical time has saved the major part of the essential farm crops in this section. Officers of the Farm Security Administration have been most helpful in solving the numerous problems involved in making this labor most effective. We desire to extend to you our most sincere appreciation for this most necessary help, and we respectfully solicit your further assistance in aiding the farmer to supply the food and fibers so necessary to our national existence.

YUMA PRODUCERS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
HUGO B. FARMER, *President,*
A. W. FRANKLIN, *Secretary.*

[Telegram]

EL CENTRO, CALIF., *December 10, 1942.*

CLAUDE WICKARD,
Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture:

The farmers of Imperial Valley express their sincere appreciation for the help you, through Farm Security Administration, have given this valley by the importation of agricultural labor from Mexico. The importation of this agriculturel labor has saved the war-essential crops of this district. The local administration of the program of Mexican importation by the Farm Security Administration has been entirely satisfactory and they have shown a fine cooperative and practical spirit in the entire enterprise.

IMPERIAL VALLEY FARMERS ASSOCIATION,
M. C. WAHL, *President,*
B. A. HARRIGAN, *Secretary.*

[Telegram]

DECEMBER 1, 1942.

CLAUDE WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
SHIRLEY SAVOY,
Denver, Colo.;

Understanding hearing on farm labor program being held. Wish to report our experiences with 230 long-staple cotton pickers imported through Farm Security Administration from southeast Missouri entirely satisfactory. This move has saved our cotton growers one-half million dollars as absolutely no local help available and provided Government with long-staple parachute material. This crop planted at your request and we definitely go on record commending importation of labor and on method of handling. Assure of our future cooperation.

PALO VERDE COTTON GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
JACK E. MARLOW, *President.*

[Baltimore Evening Sun, October 19, 1942]

NOW IS THE TIME

Four migratory-labor camps were operated on the Eastern Shore this year and the farmers are pleased with the result. More such camps may be established next year. Features of this system which appeal to employers are better distribution of labor through the pooling system used at the camps; full-time employment through systematic placement; assurance that crops will be harvested at the right time.

But what about the features which appeal to the laborers? That is important, too.

The camps have proved successful mainly because they offered the migratory farm workers decent living and working conditions. Had the camps not done this many farmers undoubtedly would have had a ruinous season. Because of the war, it is no longer necessary for the migrant worker to have to put up with the wretched quarters formerly provided for him. He can be pretty certain of finding a war-industry job.

Up to this past summer the migratory farm laborer's working conditions were appalling. He and his family, arriving at the field in their jalopy, had to live in a vermin-infested shack, without sanitation, often without safe drinking water. The situation was about the same wherever he went, in following the successive crop seasons. It has taken a war to change this. From now on, for the duration at least, the areas which are sure to get their crops harvested will be those areas in which well-run labor camps are located. And, having become used to something better than the wretched "accommodation" formerly accorded them, the laborers may be unwilling, after the war, to accept foul shacks to live in again.

But it may also turn out that the farmers themselves, having found something better than the uncertain and often inefficient labor supply of past seasons, will want to keep the labor-camp system. It works both ways. Better conditions, better workers. And a sure labor supply. Now is the time, therefore, for the farmers in regions such as the Eastern Shore whose highly perishable crops are dependent upon migrants, to plan for permanent work camps. It will be an important step toward a permanent solution of their problem.

ELM BROOK FARM,
Morton, N. Y., November 23, 1942.

Mr. J. H. WOOD:

DEAR SIR: In regards to a camp at Hamlin Beach Park, believe it was a great help to farmers. In my case would have lost one-half my tomato crop if I could not have gotten the four boys I did. They were more dependable than what few transients came along.

We are too far from Rochester to go in for help, and Hamlin Park suits us finely I think. Tomatoes, cucumbers, peaches, and apples are grown quite extensively, and plenty of help is needed at the right time.

Trusting you will consider us favorably when making out your list of camps, I am
Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY G. STRASENBURGH.

[Telegram]

WOODBURY, N. J., *January 19, 1943.*

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE CLAUDE R. WICKARD:

In view of increased production goals, shelter, and transportation of farm workers necessary for planting and harvesting of crops, urge support of farm labor transportation and housing program for agricultural workers. Prompt action absolutely necessary.

WILLARD B. KILLE,
Chairman, Gloucester County Farm Labor Committee.

[Telegram]

BRIDGETON, N. J., *January 18, 1943.*

Hon. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
United States Department of Agriculture:

Government has asked for increased production of processed vegetables in 1943. There is an acute shortage of agricultural and canning workers, also housing of same in this area, and it is extremely essential that Farm Security Administration be provided with necessary funds to carry on their good work of establishing migratory labor camps in the needed communities; also favor the transportation plan as now in operation.

NEW JERSEY CANNERS ASSOCIATION,
NEWLIN B. WATSON, *Secretary.*

SEABROOK FARMS

INVESTORS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION, INC.

Bridgeton, N. J., November 19, 1942.

Mr. J. H. WOOD,
Regional Director, Farm Security Administration,
Region 1, Upper Darby, Pa.

DEAR MR. WOOD: During 1942 our organization will have grown and processed a total of 50,000,000 pounds, packed weight, of canned, quick-frozen, and dehydrated vegetables in addition to 100,000 bushels of apples. A large portion of this pack has gone directly to the Army, the Navy, and Lend-Lease. During the winter of 1941–42, we were very doubtful of our ability to successfully produce this amount of food because of the impending labor shortage. With the exception of a few acres of lima beans and a small amount of apples, we have been able to harvest and process our entire 1942 crop without loss.

The Fram Security Administration's migrant camp has been the biggest single factor in the solution of our labor problems. At the peak of the season this camp housed over 1,000 workers. During the early part of the summer, the majority of these workers were employed by local farmers other than ourselves for the harvesting of asparagus and snap-beans. As the season progressed this work fell off and our work increased. These migrants were, therefore, provided with continuous employment with no slack periods from the end of April until the first of December. The quality of the workers living in your camp was high. We harvested about 50 percent more snap-beans this year, with a slightly smaller force than we had used in previous years. We were able to do this because the migrants that came to your camp were professional bean pickers and were able to pick faster than the type of labor we had employed in previous years.

The camp attracted many more than the 1,000 migrants it actually housed. Migrants could start up from the south with a definite destination in mind and knowing that there would be a place for them to stay when they arrived. Many of these stayed in the camp only a few days and then went to live in the housing facilities that we, and other farmers in this area, provided. In other words, the camp served as a clearing center for migratory labor as well as a housing project.

The effect of the camp on the general social conditions in this area was excellent, providing decent housing with suitable sanitary facilities; the venereal-disease clinic has been particularly effective.

The Quartermaster Corps have called on us to greatly expand our production for 1943. We feel that the one thing that could interfere with this expansion would be an inadequate supply of labor. There is not any local supply that we can draw on, and the principal drawback to utilizing the sources of labor that we

know exists in other areas is the difficulty of providing adequate housing. Many of the workers who were brought here this year under the Farm Security Administration transportation plan did not stay because we were unable to supply suitable housing. We believe that the answer to this labor problem lies in providing proper housing facilities, and that the Farm Security Administration camps provide the best, quickest and cheapest means that we know of for housing this type of labor. We, therefore, ask you to expand your facilities in this immediate vicinity to take care of 2,000 workers.

Very truly yours,

SEABROOK FARMS,
JOHN M. SEABROOK,
General Manager.

S. H. DERBY & Co.

GROWERS AND SHIPPERS OF FANCY APPLES

Phone, Dover 710–R 2

WOODSIDE, DEL., *September 5 1942.*

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: You are most likely interested in the reactions of the people in the communities in which there are migratory labor camps. The one at Woodside, Del., I believe is serving a useful purpose and justifying its existing. Had it not been for the camp agent many early apples, peaches, and tomatoes would have been lost.

Most of the time there was a demand for more labor than was available, but there was a short period when there was considerable idleness. I think if the farmers knew when they were planning their year's work that there would be labor available that wanted continuous work there could and would be crops planted so that there would be very little idle time. If transportation at the camp was available and there was an over supply of labor usually some other section of the State would be very glad of it, thus serving a larger need.

Some local farm labor is being drafted into the Army, others are going into defense work so that next year the labor situation on the farms will be much more acute and the migratory labor camp program will be much more needed. Farmers cannot be expected to plant the quantity of crops needed to fill the present demands unless they have some assurance that labor will be available for harvest. It is useless to plant crops and let them rot in the field, and most farmers are not in a financial position to take a chance of this happening. There is labor enough available somewhere in the country so that this need not happen. The problem is to get it where it is needed when it is needed and it seems to me that the only way to do this is for some Government agency to know the need and then transport the laborers where this need is most urgent. It is going to be harder next year for migrants to transport themselves, as their cars and tires are getting older and no way to replace them. It is a waste of money to have labor camps and no way for the migrants to get to them, so it seems to me that the Government should go a step further and provide that transportation.

I hope that the migratory labor camp program will be continued and expanded; if it is not, I do not see how the large quantity of farm products needed can be grown unless some other means of harvesting can be found.

Yours truly,

A. F. WALKER,
Chairman, Labor Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, give us some information about these.

Major WALKER. Incidentally, in connection with the Mexican movement, we already have applications from employers for that labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are truck farms?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir; and beet growers and citrus growers.

The CHAIRMAN. They are what is called flash crops; they are seasonal; they have an accentuated labor peak period.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

DIFFICULTIES OF GETTING YEAR ROUND FARM LABOR

The CHAIRMAN. On these midwestern farms and northern dairy farms we want all-the-year-round labor to raise stock and produce poultry and dairy products.

Secretary WICKARD. The only hope I have there, of course, is to get a number of people who have had experience on farms before to return to farms. I know of several instances where that is being done because filling stations are closing down and a lot of civilian factories, you know, are going to have to close down. We are hopeful we will be able to get some of those people to go back to the farms. We hope that we can move some of the people where there is a surplus, from the cut-over regions in Minnesota and Wisconsin, to southern Minnesota and Wisconsin dairy farms, or from some of the regions of the Ozarks up into other areas in Missouri.

We also hope that we can train people who want to go on farms. Now, this is the most difficult problem of all, to get the trained type of worker, I acknowledge that, and that is the only thing that alarms me because they have left the farms in such great numbers. As has been brought out, a large number of them have gone into industry. I do not know how to prevent them from going into industry, because, as you well know, industry is paying about three times as much per hour as farmers are paying, and their conditions are more attractive too, such as overtime and things of that kind. It is difficult, Congressman Cannon, and I am not in any way minimizing it. We are going to do the very best we can to enlist everybody to go back to the farms, and we are going to do the very best we can to get the Selective Service people to get the local draft boards to keep what they have on the farms.

We will have to do like I did last summer. I got a high-school boy 15 years old to come out with me, and he worked all summer, and this winter he got a job near his school where he works on a poultry farm. So, I hired a man 62 years old the other day, a man who had been a Danish immigrant. He is too old to do much heavy work, but he can still do a lot of work around a farm, and he has had experience. I am giving you my own experience, and yet I know it is not the kind of labor I would like to have on farms.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this question, Mr. Secretary: You mentioned a filling-station employee who had been on the farm before, and whose filling station is now closed. How does the Government assist there? Wouldn't he go back to the farm without your spending this money?

I do not see where this program would render any help in a case like that.

What training have you given these Mexicans who come in here?

TRAINING FOR FARM WORK

Secretary WICKARD. We have not given any training to the Mexicans, but we have trained some of the boys from Kentucky who have gone into Ohio and some of the boys from northern Wisconsin who have gone into southern Wisconsin to work on the dairy farms.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the length of this period of training?

Secretary WICKARD. It is not very long. It usually lasts 2 or 3 weeks. Usually we cannot keep them long enough to give them the training that we would like to give them.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the employer be in a position to give them some training which is a little more highly specialized for his particular job?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; I think training in actual service is the best kind of training.

The CHAIRMAN. And in the case of the high-school boy and the more elderly man who supplanted him, did you get them without Government help?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

LOSS OF NORMAL SUPPLY OF SEASONAL LABOR

The CHAIRMAN. Then how does this enormous project here which starts off with $65,000,000 justify itself when you can go out and get your men, and when farmers can train their own employees, and when filling-station attendants when their jobs dry up go back to the farm of their own accord?

Secretary WICKARD. This would not, of course, do anything along that line, so far as assisting those people is concerned. We do think this is a plan which might be helpful in addition to that. Now, you know that this has reference to the migrant type of labor which heretofore has had jalopies, and who have been able to get from one area to another but who are not able to get there now. That is what this program is for. In large areas of the country, especially on both seaboards and in the sugar-beet industry, they have relied on this type of labor heretofore, which is not now available. We are just faced with the problem that we cannot get that type of labor we want to put out the crops and to harvest them without doing something similar to this.

The CHAIRMAN. This $65,000,000 is intended to cover what period?

Secretary WICKARD. To January 1, the calendar year.

The CHAIRMAN. According to your estimates here you have estimated for 110,000 laborers by July 1, 1943, and 240,000 during the fiscal year 1944. Now, you are only providing there for 350,000 laborers, whereas you say your needs are 3,500,000. Will that materially solve this problem, when you still will have a need for or a demand for 3,150,000 workers?

Secretary WICKARD. I have tried to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that we are relying upon the local people for the greatest number of people, which they have always had to rely upon, to get the seasonal farm work done, and that the transportation here is to take care of people who have always made a living, and others too, if we can get them like the Mexicans, by following the crops from one part of the country to another. For instance, on the eastern seaboard here they are now helping in the planting and harvesting of citrus crops, and they will come north as the season advances, and perhaps go back south again in the fall. At the present time they do not have any jalopies, and they do not have any gasoline if they did have, nor do they have any other way of getting there to help to farm those crops, and this is to provide that transportation for them.

The CHAIRMAN. This provides about $100 apiece for these workers at this rate, $21,000,000, not counting the overhead. You are proposing to provide not only transportation but subsistence.

FARM LABOR CENTERS OR CAMPS

(See p. 57)

I see you ask $1,341,621 for the last 4 months of the present fiscal year for farm labor centers, and $3,380,451 for the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1944. This is to be used in the operation of 250 new camps. How many camps do you have at the present time?

Major WALKER. We have 95.

The CHAIRMAN. None of this money will be used for those 95 camps, but the money will be used for the new camps?

Major WALKER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. From what source do you receive the money for the maintenance of these 95 camps?

Major WALKER. I am sorry, this does include money for operating the 95 camps.

The CHAIRMAN. How are they being maintained at the present time?

Secretary WICKARD. Out of our regular appropriation.

Mr. MAYCOCK. They are being maintained, Mr. Chairman, from the appropriation "Loans, Grants, and Rural Rehabilitation."

The CHAIRMAN. Could you continue to maintain them without additional funds? Why can't you continue to supply them out of your regular funds?

Major WALKER. We are taking that entirely out of the next budget. There is nothing in that for camps, in the regular Agriculture budget.

Mr. SIEGEL. There is for this fiscal year, but after that there will not be.

The CHAIRMAN. What money is there specifically for camps in this program in the 1943 bill?

Mr. MAYCOCK. There is $1,400,000 under the appropriation "Loans, Grants, and Rural Rehabilitation" for the operation of camps.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it specify the number of camps?

Mr. MAYCOCK. No, sir; it does not specify the number of camps.

The CHAIRMAN. But that amount maintains the 95 camps?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Yes, sir; that maintains the 95 camps. But it is being used up at such a rate that it is estimated that it will be exhausted at the end of this month or shortly thereafter. So, this estimate does include money for the camps for the rest of this year. The President, however, in submitting the Budget for 1944 for "Loans, grants, and and rural rehabilitation," specifically took out the funds for camps on the basis that they would be provided through this estimate for farm labor which is before you now.

The CHAIRMAN. That money was provided in the regular 1943 bill with the intention of taking care of all of your needs for this purpose up until June 30th?

Mr. MAYCOCK. That is right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How does it happen that you are exhausting it here in March?

Mr. MAYCOCK. I think, as Major Walker can state, the problem has been a larger and more acute one than we had anticipated.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you have operated more camps? If you had operated fewer camps the money would have been sufficient to carry you through the entire fiscal year?

Mr. MAYCOCK. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. But you put in so many camps that it was not sufficient to operate them?

Mr. MAYCOCK. No, sir; no new camps have been constructed. It was the same 95 camps.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you make your error in estimating the amount required?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Ordinarily there are a certain number of camps during the winter season that you do not have to operate. In other words, it is during the summer and fall season when the camps are in greatest demand.

Rather than to operate all 95 of the camps until the funds are exhausted, the Farm Security Administration has closed approximately 40 camps so that the remaining funds from the $1,400,000 will last until June 30. It is for the purpose of being able to reopen part of the 95 camps, as well as to operate the proposed new camps, that funds are requested in the pending estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. With the 250 new camps you will have 345 camps altogether. In the first place, tell us something about what a camp is, how it is operated, and what it costs, and then tell us where they are located.

Secretary WICKARD. I am not familiar with where all of the camps are or what they cost, or all of that sort of thing. I have made personal inspections of some of the camps on the west coast. The people are maintained largely in one-room houses.

The CHAIRMAN. All of those houses belong to the Government?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is all Government property?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir; and in some cases we have tents. A great number of these new ones will be tents, too.

Major WALKER. A substantial number of them.

Secretary WICKARD. They are usually provided with a board floor to keep them out of the dirt, and they usually try to provide some sanitation, and water and things like that. For that I cannot give the exact cost, but the farmers in California, where we have had most of these camps and on the west coast are very anxious to have them and to keep them going because of the shortage of the labor supply in that area.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no charge made to the occupants of these camps for rent?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; in some instances, but not in all instances.

Major WALKER. They have now put them all on a rental basis.

The CHAIRMAN. To what extent are they self-sustaining?

Major WALKER. They are not self-sustaining.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you also provide food in addition to housing facilities in these camps?

Major WALKER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are these camps movable or permanent?

Major WALKER. All of the new ones we are talking about here are movable. Some of the older ones were permanent camps.

The CHAIRMAN. On an average how many people do each of these camps accommodate?

Major WALKER. I would say on an average 300 people, in all.

Secretary WICKARD. That is 300 in all, not workers, but people.

The CHAIRMAN. On an average how many individuals per worker are there in the camps?

Secretary WICKARD. I suppose five or six. Usually they have pretty large families.

The CHAIRMAN. Three thousand then would include about 600 workers?

Secretary WICKARD. That is my own personal observation.

Mr. SIEGEL. There are about four people to each family.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; there are about four people to each family. There is more than one member of the family working; the man and wife both work usually.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, there is the man and wife, and about how many children are there to each family on an average?

Secretary WICKARD. I am guessing in the figure I gave.

Mr. SIEGEL. There are about three children to each family.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be a total of five.

Mr. TOWNSEND. You get about three workers out of a family.

The CHAIRMAN. And some of the children work?

Mr. TOWNSEND. One child, the wife and the husband.

The CHAIRMAN. The wife works, too?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Major WALKER. Yes; usually in migratory families.

The CHAIRMAN. Out of these 3,000 individuals, how many workers would you expect to get?

Secretary WICKARD. We were talking about 300 to start off. How many workers out of each hundred people in the camp would you estimate there are?

Major WALKER. About 55.

The CHAIRMAN. Then with these 250 additional camps you would take care of in the aggregate how many workers?

Major WALKER. The capacity of the 250 proposed new camps will be 62,500 people, and in the present 95 camps there is a capacity of 60,000.

The CHAIRMAN. You would take care of about 122,500 people at one time?

Major WALKER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I take it for granted your camp population is very unstable? These are itinerant people, and they come and go?

Major WALKER. It is in the permanent camps. The mobile labor centers that we are talking about in this new program will be moved to fit the needs so that they will be pretty full during the entire time of operation, whatever the season is.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1943.

FARM-LABOR PROBLEM

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will resume consideration of the estimate for the farm-labor program. Governor Townsend, we shall be glad to hear you.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I would like to make a statement, Mr. Chairman, from this viewpoint: As Director of the Food Production Administration of the Department of Agriculture, I was asked by the Secretary to create and I have created, in my Administration, a farm-labor branch. And it is my intention to use, just so far as it is possible, the agencies already existing to take care of this problem.

83608—43——3

Naturally, I am approaching the problem from the standpoint of the problem as it exists. If there is some way that Congress or the Army or somebody could put the farm labor back, that has gone into the Army, and that which has gone into industry, and especially that trained and experienced farm labor, it certainly would make our job much easier. But if it cannot be done—and I am fearful that maybe it cannot to the full degree that we would like for the coming season—I am proceeding on the assumption that I must take the problem as it exists and try to solve it.

We believe that most of it will have to be solved by mobilizing the labor that is now in the counties, in the small towns and cities, for the peak load.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not considered, Governor Townsend, the exemption of men now on the farm from further draft or the furloughing of men, key men, who have been taken from essential farms, who are now in the Army?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am proceeding on the assumption that no more key men will be taken, because I think we now have law and regulations sufficient to prevent the taking of any more. We have already had 350,000 classed——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). You say you are proceeding on the assumption that no more will be taken. That assumption has not been justified in view of the fact, from my own experience in my immediate neighborhood, men were taken last week, whose absence will seriously cripple the operation of essential farms, which are producing livestock and dairy products.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, if I may interject at this point, it is my personal opinion—and many Members of Congress to whom I have talked are having the same experience—that the draft boards are not paying a bit of attention to this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the difficulty.

Mr. WOODRUM. Within the last 2 weeks, a farm family in my district, who have a small farm, who are raising stuff for the market and shipping stuff every day, who have two sons who volunteered and went into the Army, and who have a third son that has been drafted, after telling the draft board what happened, were told, "The best thing you can do is to sell your farm." That is the situation, Governor. I think you had better not accept just what some official tells you is happening, but try to find out from the draft boards whether they are really doing what they are supposed to do. I think they are not.

Mr. TABER. I am having the same experience you are. I could give details, but there is no use doing it.

Mr. LUDLOW. I might say that our Governor and I have been working for 2 weeks to get a man out of the Army, who is a key man in agriculture, and have not made a dent in the situation so far. They just do not pay any attention to it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is a separate matter. I necessarily must proceed on the assumption that we are not going to get any of those back. I hope we do, but I must proceed on the assumption that we will not. But I am proceeding on the assumption that no more will leave, because I think we have ample rules and regulations and laws, and I have had a few cases where they were refused by the local board, appealed to the appeal board, were refused there, and I sent them

over to the President and the President exempted them and put them in class C.

The CHAIRMAN. Governor, I think your assumption is in the same class with the case of the fellow whose lawyer called on him in jail, and he said to his client, "They cannot put you in jail"; to which his client repiled, "But I am in jail."

These men are being taken from farms this week. How long has it been since that directive was issued?

Mr. WOODRUM. And by the thousands. In my judgment, if you surveyed the various local boards and get a glimpse at the inductees as they walk down to the railroad station, you will find that one-third or half of them are farm boys.

The CHAIRMAN. The number on the farm has been reduced now to an absolute minimum, so that every essential man taken away from a farm means that we are interfering with the production of the maximum supply of food which that farm might produce.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. In a crisis, when we are being told that food is essential to the winning of the war and the peace.

Mr. LUDLOW. Governor, you expressed the opinion that key men would be exempted—that is, key men in agriculture—but that is not going to solve the problem. We have got to have workers in agriculture by the thousands in order to meet the necessities of the farm economy.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes; but General Hershey asked us to devise a means of determining when a man was essential for farm work and the Department of Agriculture devised such a measuring stick.

The CHAIRMAN. And the boards are paying absolutely no attention to it. You devised it, but it is not mandatory to follow it, and they are paying no attention to it.

Mr. TABER. Have you got that measuring stick with you?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am sorry, I do not. It is predicated on the base that one man can take care of 16 cows or equivalent, and then we name the equivalents, in all of the different crops.

Mr. TABER. Will you send us a copy of that?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I shall be happy to furnish that for the record.

Mr. TABER. If it is too long for the record, at least send us a few copies for the use of the committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The statement is as follows:

THE WAR UNITS PLAN

This year, as never before, the Nation is dependent on agriculture for the successful prosecution of the war. Every farm will need to make its maximum contribution to production of the farm products most needed in our war effort. The war units plan is a way of measuring what each farm can contribute and a basis for assisting each farmer in increasing his output.

Under this plan, war unit values are given to all crops and livestock products important to the war effort. These values are based chiefly on the amount of labor required in their production.

One war unit of production is the number of crop acres or the number of livestock that require approximately the same amount of labor, exclusive of seasonal peak labor periods, as is necessary to keep one dairy cow.

16 WAR UNITS PER WORKER

As a national average each regularly employed farm operator or worker should be able to produce 16 war units in 1943, if he has sufficient land and other resources. Our national objective should, therefore, be the production by as many

farms as possible of 16 or more war units per worker. Recognizing, however, that many farms at present are not equipped to produce as much as 16 war units, Selective Service Regulations have suggested 8 war units as a floor for deferment purposes. On many highly mechanized farms, or farms which have been able to adopt other measures for increasing labor efficiency, one worker can produce much more than 16 war units.

WAR UNIT VALUES

In the appended table the principal farm products are divided in two groups—those in Group I which are sufficiently important to the war effort to be given war unit values, and those in Group II which are not so important, and which will not be used in determining the war unit production of the farm.

The values or conversion factors provide the means of converting acres of crops and number of livestock into war units. These conversion factors are based in large part on United States weighted average labor requirements. Only the labor of regularly employed workers that is performed directly on that crop or class of livestock is included. For example, the seasonal labor usually hired for assisting the regular labor force in husking corn, in harvesting and threshing small grain, or in chopping and picking cotton is not included. Moreover, the labor for growing the feed crops fed to livestock is credited independently and not as part of the labor on livestock. Thus a farmer who bought all his feed would need 16 milk cows to have 16 war units on his farm, but a farmer who has 20 acres of corn (4 war units), 30 acres of oats (2 war units), and 20 acres of non-irrigated alfalfa hay (2 war units) would need only 8 cows to have a total of 16 war units on his farm.

War unit conversion factors for farm products

	Number of animals or acres equal to 1 war unit	Unit of production	Conversion factor
GROUP 1-A. LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS			
Beef cattle:			
1. Farm herds	10	1 head	0.10
2. Feedlot	20	do	.05
3. Range	15	do	.07
4. Stocker (bought and run on grass or grazed in fields).	75	do	.01
Dairy cattle:			
1. Milk cow	1	do	1.00
2. Other dairy cattle and calves	10	do	.10
Hogs:			
1. Sows to farrow, spring	3	1 sow and pigs	.33
2. Sows to farrow, fall	3	do	.33
3. Feeder pigs (bought and sold during year).	30	1 head	.03
Poultry:			
1. Broilers and ducks	600	100 birds	.17
2. Hens, laying pullets, and ducks for egg production.	75	do	1.30
3. Flock replacement	300	do	.33
4. Turkeys and geese	40	do	2.50
Sheep and goats:			
1. Farm flocks	30	1 head	.03
2. Lambs in feedlot	160	100 head	.62
3. Range sheep and goats	45	1 head	.02
4. Milk goats	3	do	.33
5. Stockers (bought and run on grass or grazed in fields).	100	100 head	1.00
GROUP 1-B. CROPS			
Fiber, oil crops, and potatoes:			
1. Castor beans	3	1 acre	.33
2. Cotton:			
(a) American-Egyptian, Sea Island, and Upland 15/16 inch and over.	1.5	do	.67
(b) Upland under 15/16 inch	3	do	.33
3. Flaxseed and soy beans	12	do	.08
4. Hemp	5	do	.20
5. Peanuts, Irish potatoes, and sweet potatoes.	2	do	.50

War unit conversion factors for farm products—Continued

	Number of animals or acres equal to 1 war unit	Unit of production	Conversion factor
GROUP I-A. LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS—continued			
Field crops:			
1. Alfalfa hay (irrigated), broom corn, corn for grain and silage, dry edible beans, green peas for processing, rice, sweet corn for processing.	5	1 acre	0.20
2. Alfalfa hay seed, cover crop seed, nonirrigated alfalfa hay, grain sorghum, other tame hay and seed.	10	do	.10
3. Barley, dry field peas, oats, and rye	15	do	.07
4. Sweet corn for fresh consumption and hybrid seed corn.	3	do	.33
5. Wild or native hay	30	do	.03
6. Wheat	20	do	.05
Fruits:			
1. Plants and trees for fruit production replacement and camouflage.	10	do	.10
2. Small fruit and berries: Blackberries, blueberries (tame), boysenberries, cranberries, currants, dewberries, gooseberries, grapes, loganberries, raspberries, strawberries, and youngberries.	0.7	do	1.50
3. Tree fruit (deciduous and citrus):			
(a) Bearing orchard (irrigated)	1	do	1.00
(b) Bearing orchard (nonirrigated)	2	do	.50
(c) Nonbearing orchard	5	do	.20
Medicinal, insecticide, and rubber plants: Aconite, belladonna, digitalis, henbane, pyrethrum, guayule, and Kok-saghyz.	0.4	do	2.50
Wood products:			
1. Logs delivered to local mill (includes piling).	10,000 board feet	1,000 board feet	.10
2. Logs sawed in small mill (on farm or nearby).	5,000 board feet	do	.20
3. Hewn railroad ties	200 ties	100 ties	.50
4. Fence posts	500 posts	100 posts	.20
5. Pulpwood, fuelwood, bolts for excelsior, handles, etc.	15 cords	1 cord (4 foot lengths)	.07
Naval stores	200 faces	100 faces	.50
Vegetables for fresh consumption and processing: Asparagus (from present plantings), beets, broccoli, brussel sprouts, cabbage, carrots, chard, cauliflower, collards, escarole, green leafy lettuce, green pascal celery, green peas for fresh consumption only, peppers, kale, lima beans, mustard greens, onions, parsnips, rutabaga, snap beans, spinach, tomatoes, and turnips.	1	1 acre	1.00
Vegetable plants and seeds	0.7	do	1.50
Other food and special crops:			
1. Honey	25 colonies	1 colony	.04
2. Tree nuts (bearing orchards):			
(a) Almonds, filberts, and walnuts	2	1 acre	.50
(b) Pecans (tame) and tung	5	do	.20
3. Tree nuts (nonbearing orchards and replacement stock).	15	do	.07
4. Sugar cane for sugar and syrup	1	do	1.00
5. Sugar beets, sugar beet seed, sorghum and sorgo syrup.	2	do	.50
6. Tobacco	0.5	do	2.00
GROUP II. NO WAR UNIT CREDITS			
Special crops:			
1. Cantaloupes			
2. Hops			
3. Popcorn			
4. Watermelons			
Vegetables:			
1. Artichokes, celery (bleached), eggplant, and lettuce (Iceberg).			
2. Kohlrabi, cucumbers, horseradish, okra, radishes, and rhubarb.			
3. Garlic and leeks			
4. Squash and pumpkins			

NOTE.—Other crops not listed.

GENERAL PROGRAM FOR SECURING FARM LABOR

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, Governor, it resolves itself into this proposition, that you are every day taking away men from essential farms; men who have lived on the farm all their lives, whose life training has been in agriculture, whose interest is in agriculture, and whose desire it is to stay on the farm. And you are supplanting them with men from the city, frequently men who have had no knowledge of farming and no interest in farming, and who have no desire to go on the farm, with the certainty that they cannot produce results.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, it is not our hope to be able to secure from any source adequately trained key men to take the place of trained farm operators in the dairy and livestock field.

We can only do that if——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Governor, I interrupted your statement, I believe before you had concluded. Had you concluded your opening statement?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No, I did want to say something further.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed. We are glad to hear you.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Starting on the assumption that we will not get back to the farms any of this labor, especially trained labor, we have devised a plan, the best we could devise, to try in a measure to take the place of those men.

The main part of this labor that we hope to get will be by an effort, through the Extension Service and the other boards, to mobilize labor for peak planting and harvesting periods in the counties, county by county, over the United States. We believe that that can be done for those peak periods rather successfully because it was done very successfully in California last year, where more than 100,000 people were persuaded to come from cities and towns in California out to the farms. They did harvest last year the largest crop that was ever harvested in California. California probably has as acute a labor problem as any State in the Union, occasioned by the fact that many airplane and other war industries are located in California.

To take the place of the labor that has always been depended upon on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts; up through Texas and on into Idaho, Washington, and Oregon, to take care of the cotton, beets, and fruits, and also that labor that has migrated up the Mississippi Valley to take care of the cotton and the canning crops, we have devised a method of trying, partially by Government expense, to mobilize what can be found in the labor-plus areas—and we have a few—and transport them into the labor-minus areas.

That will be the most expensive part of our effort.

We hope to get about 50,000 Mexicans. The Mexican Government believes that that is the maximum they can spare. We hope to get between 10,000 and 20,000 Japanese into the fields during the harvest season. The conscientious objectors, only about 2,000, have been turned over to the Department.

Therefore, our plan is to try as best we can to supplement the labor that remains on the farms in order to plant, grow, and harvest this year's crop that we hope will be bigger than any crop that was ever produced in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that conclude your statement, Governor?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That concludes my statement.

FARM LABOR PROGRAM BY PROJECTS

The CHAIRMAN. Governor, you propose to take care of the crop year of 1943; this is your 1943 crop year program?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And you propose to cover 4 months in the fiscal year 1943—that is from March to June—and 6 months in fiscal 1944; in other words, the calendar year 1943.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are asking for that purpose $65,075,000, in six projects.

The six projects are:

(1) Farm-labor transportation.

(2) The establishment, maintenance, and operation of farm-labor centers.

(3) Mobilization of local labor resources, nonfarm youth, and women for farm labor.

(4) Investigation of farm wage rates.

Does that include the recommendation for the fixing of minimum farm wage rates?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No. We have only two obligations concerning farm wage rates. One is the wage rate for the Mexicans and the other is for domestic labor. We feel an obligation to arrange for the wage rates with the employer, so we can tell these people whom we are trying to mobilize what they may expect. The agreement would be between the employer and employee.

The CHAIRMAN. Your fifth project is farm jobs simplification and your sixth is administration.

This outline of the projects may be made a part of the record at this point.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

United States Department of Agriculture, farm labor program

Projects	Last 4 months, fiscal year 1943	First 6 months, fiscal year 1944
1. Farm labor transportation:		
(a) Seasonal laborers:		
(1) Contemplates transportation, medical care, subsistence, etc., for approximately 110,000 laborers by July 1, 1943, and 240,000 during fiscal year 1944	$9,636,000	$21,055,000
(b) Year-around labor—contemplates movement of 17,000 hired hands between March and July 1943 and 25,000 during first 6 months of 1944	2,502,000	3,807,500
(c) Supervision	901,538	2,018,826
Total, project 1	13,039,538	26,881,326
2. Farm labor centers:		
(a) Operations, maintenance, and management: Operation of 250 new camps (capacity of 62,500) and 95 present camps (capacity 60,000)	1,341,621	3,380,451
(b) Development and construction: Construction of 250 new camps and costs of 300 sites	10,650,000	2,100,000
Total, project 2	11,991,621	5,480,451

United States Department of Agriculture, farm labor program—Continued

Projects	Last 4 months, fiscal year 1943	First 6 months, fiscal year 1944
3. Mobilization of local labor resources, nonfarm youth, and women for farm labor:		
(a) Recruitment and placement of local labor	$1,515,750	$2,216,750
(b) Victory-farm volunteers:		
(1) Youth from cities over 25,000 population: On-farm supervision; technical assistance to and cooperation with Office of Education and United States Employment Service in recruiting, training, and placing 100,000 recruits in 1,200 counties	800,000	800,000
(2) Youth from cities of 10,000 to 25,000 population: On-farm supervision; technical assistance to and cooperation with Office of Education and United States Employment Service in recruiting, training, and placing 40,000 recruits in 400 counties	100,000	100,000
(3) Youth from small cities, towns, and villages: On-farm supervision; technical assistance to and cooperation with Office of Education and United States Employment Service in recruiting, training, and placing 60,000 recruits in 1,400 counties:		
(c) Women's land army	50,000	100,000
(d) Federal administration and supervision	52,424	76,582
(e) State administration and supervision	206,330	316,469
Total, project 3	2,724,504	3,434,801
4. Investigation of farm wage rates	35,000	61,895
5. Farm jobs simplification	65,343	63,091
6. Administration	345,835	951,595
Total	28,201,841	36,873,159
Total estimate, Mar. 1, 1943, to Dec. 31, 1943	65,075,000	

NUMBER OF WORKERS TO BE TRANSFERRED

The CHAIRMAN. Your purpose, then, is to move something like 400,000 men to replace men on the farms. You expect to move them and get them into operation between the spring of 1942 and the spring of 1943. How many do you propose to move? Have you given us a figure there? I am a little uncertain.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will ask Major Walker to answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. Just give me an estimated figure to go on.

Major WALKER. Approximately 350,000 seasonal workers will be moved. Approximately 110,000 will be moved between March 1 and June 30, 1943, and about 240,000 between July 1 and December 31, 1943.

The CHAIRMAN. But they are to replace something like 400,000 men lost from the farms between the spring of 1942 and the spring of 1943?

Then you propose, as I get it from your justification, to move 350,000 seasonal workers; 42,000 year-round laborers?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Two hundred thousand youths from the cities and towns to the country; and how many women?

Mr. TOWNSEND. The women and children are put in one group.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they included in this figure of 200,000?

Major WALKER. No, sir; they are included in the total farm mobilization. It will represent about 3,200,000 except for a limited number of women that will probably be recruited in connection with the Women's Land Army in certain areas. We have no figure on what that will be.

The CHAIRMAN. Roughly, how many would you say will be in this Women's Land Army which you propose to move?

Mr. WILSON. Around 10,000 for year-around farm work in 1943 with a somewhat larger number, possibly 50,000, for crop season work.

The CHAIRMAN. You propose to move, then, 600,000 men during this calendar year; that is, 600,000 laborers during the calendar year, is that correct?

Major WALKER. Except that most of those women will not be moved very far from their home, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. But they are nonfarm women and you expect to put them on the farm?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

TRANSPORTATION, ETC., OF SEASONAL LABORERS

The CHAIRMAN. These 350,000 seasonal workers whom you expect to move, you are providing a total cost of $30,691,000. That includes transportation, medical care, and so forth. Those are the workers that you refer to as having worked in California?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are workers, as I understand, who service what are called flash crops?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes. They would be moved from area to area, up the coast, up the Mississippi Valley, and through the Plains States. Those are the ones for whom the cost of moving will be high. Those are to take the place of the normal migrant laborers that did move when there was a labor surplus.

TRANSPORTATION, ETC., OF YEAR-ROUND LABOR

The CHAIRMAN. You also propose to move 42,000 year-round workers. That would make a total of 392,000 at a total cost of approximately $37,000,000.

DISTRIBUTION OF RECRUITED LABOR

Geographically, how do you expect to distribute these laborers?

Mr. TOWNSEND (indicating on chart). These dots represent the farm-labor centers we hope to establish. The crosses represent the centers that have already been established. You can see that they cover three general areas across the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Atlantic seaboard, the Mississippi Valley, the Great Lakes; the Atlantic seaboard being the first area, then the Mississippi Valley and the Great Lakes the second area, and the Pacific and the Great Plains the third area?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. In what proportion do you expect to move them in those three areas? That is, how many in each area?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is estimated we will move up the Atlantic seaboard, between March 1 and July 1 about 31,000; and between July 1 and December 31, 94,000; in the Mississippi Valley and Great Lakes between March 1 and July 1, 14,000; and between July 1 and December 31, 41,000.

The CHAIRMAN. A total of 55,000.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Then in the Pacific and Great Plains area, we propose to move between March 1 and July 1 65,000 and between July 1 and December 31, in that area, 105,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That is an over-all of 170,000 in the Pacific and Great Plains area?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes, sir; 170,000 in the Pacific and Great Plains area is right, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. By moving, you mean that you intend to supply them?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And from what source do you expect to secure them?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will have Major Walker answer that.

SOURCES OF RECRUITED LABOR

(See p. 6)

The CHAIRMAN. Take first the Atlantic seaboard. Where do you expect to secure those 127,000?

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Atlantic seaboard, within the area, and from Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

The CHAIRMAN. This labor is now engaged in doing what?

Mr. TOWNSEND. This labor, most of which we call underemployed, partially employed——

The CHAIRMAN. Is it in the city or the country?

Major WALKER. We have been getting them from both places, so far.

Mr. TOWNSEND. From cities, towns, and some from the country.

Mr. TABER. All colored?

Major WALKER. Most of them from that area are colored.

The CHAIRMAN. Will that discommode the farmers in that area who have been accustomed heretofore to rely on that labor, that you are moving out?

Major WALKER. A lot of the labor from that area has moved backward and forward constantly in the whole migratory movement. They would move themselves now, if they had any means of transportation.

We try to recruit so as to keep from taking too many from one area.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the attitude of the farmers in that area, in the areas from which you are taking this labor toward this removal of labor from their vicinity?

Major WALKER. In some areas they have not had any objection. In others there has been very vigorous objection.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Has that always been the case, even when there was a plentiful supply of labor?

Major WALKER. Yes; I think that was true. But at that time the Government was not involved.

The CHAIRMAN. It has never been attempted before on this scale?

Major WALKER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Mississippi Valley and the Great Lakes: Where do you propose to secure those 55,000?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Within the area, and in Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Texas, and Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the removal of men from Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Texas, and Oklahoma in any way militate against the interests of employers of labor in those States?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Of course, you understand that those areas have their harvest season much earlier than the harvest season farther north, and many will have completed their farm work in those areas before they will be transported north.

The CHAIRMAN. But the planting season is also much earlier; will you return them in time for the planting season?

Major WALKER. We are returning them now. As an illustration those who were moved north to New Jersey last year are now being returned to Florida. We will be recruiting labor in Florida in June and July for areas of need in the North.

METHODS OF RECRUITMENT

The CHAIRMAN. We have had complaint, and rather urgent complaint, from Mississippi, Georgia, and Alabama that their labor is being moved over to Florida, and that it interferes with their planting season, which is beginning in the near future. We have had protests from individual farmers down there and from two of the farm organizations to that effect.

We were given a typical circular that is being distributed down there. It reads:

FARM LABOR WANTED—WAGES $3 TO $5 PER DAY

Spend the winter in Florida. Help the United States Government save fruit and vegetable crops needed to win the war. Return home next spring in time to make your own crop. The Government will pay travel expenses for workers and all members of their families to and from the Florida jobs.

Wages are set by the Government at not less than $3 per day and 4 days' work per week is guaranteed. Housing is free and medical care if needed. All jobs are under Government contract. Most of the work is on piece-rate basis and good workers can earn $5 per day and up.

Regular employed farm workers between 18 and 45 many get exemption from the draft. (See Selective Service Release No. 168.) Farm workers so exemps from the draft are free to go anywhere in the United States to work on farmt producing crops needed for the war effort. Workers and their families going to Florida should carry with them enough clothing, bedding, and cooking utensils. Each person can carry up to 75 pounds of baggage free. Every man of draft age must have his draft card. Everyone must have sugar and other ration books.

Each worker, whom we sent out, is required to take out a membership card in the Migratory Agricultural Workers Union. The initiation fee is $1 and monthly dues are $1 per month while employed (paid-up members of the regular S. T. F. U. locals are not charged initiation fees. Dues paid in advance are adjusted.) There are no other charges made for the protection the union offers. We cooperate with the War Manpower Commission and its operating agencies, the United States Employment Service and Farm Security Administration in recruiting and placing farm labor.

Mr. LUDLOW. Who put that out?

Mr. TABER. The Farm Security Administration?

The CHAIRMAN. No; I think this is by an organization that is trying to get members to join, but it is done under the activities of the Farm Security Administration.

Now we are told that essential labor needed in these States is being drawn off to Florida and that they will be in Florida at a time when the planting season begins, and will interfere with putting in a crop in those States this spring. Are you familiar with that situation?

Major WALKER. I am not familiar with that circular at all. I never heard of it before. The Florida peak is in February. The Florida growers have normally obtained their labor from this same area for that peak. They should be finished there, the large majority of them, by the end of this month or early in March and be returned to their homes.

Mr. TABER. Are these people required to belong to a union?

Major WALKER. No, sir; they are not required to belong to a union.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I assure you, gentlemen, that anything with which I am concerned in the Government will have no part in anything like that.

SEASONAL FARM LABOR AREAS OF DEMAND

The CHAIRMAN. This table showing the farm labor areas of demand and the source of laborers to be transported and the estimated number to be transported, will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The table referred to follows:)

	Farm labor areas of demand		
	Atlantic seaboard	Mississippi Valley and Great Lakes	Pacific and Great Plains
1. Estimated number to be transported:			
(a) Between Mar. 1 and July 1, 1943.	31,000	14,000	65,000.
(b) Between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1943.	94,000	41,000	105,000.
2. Principal crops needing seasonal labor.	Truck crops, potatoes, fruits, sugarcane.	Sugar beets, fruits, and vegetables, field peas and beans, sugarcane, potatoes.	Sugar beets, wheat, field peas and beans, potatoes, fruit, truck crops, guayule rubber, long-staple cotton.
3. Seasons in which such labor is needed.	North: June to July, September to October. Middle Atlantic: April to July. Florida: November to May (February peak).	Great Lakes: June to July, October to November. Corn Belt: June to July, September to October. Delta: April to October	Northern Plains: April, July to August. Southern Plains: May to June, October. Texas-Oklahoma: April to May, November to May (February peak). Mountain: May to June, October. Pacific Southwest: December, February to March, September to October. Pacific Northwest: May, September to October.
4. Source of laborers to be transported.	Within the area, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana.	Within the area, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Texas, and Oklahoma.	Within the area, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Mexico.

PROPOSED MOVEMENT OF YEAR-ROUND WORKERS

The CHAIRMAN. Will you give me the detailed distribution of these 42,000 workers? I note in your justification, which you submit, you tabulate the estimated replacements which need to be made between March 1 and December 31, 1943.

Mr. TOWNSEND. We have it between March and July and then between July and December 31.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you take the entire period, March 1, 1943, to December 31, 1943, taking first the Northeastern and Middle Atlantic area.

Mr. TOWNSEND. We hope to recruit from within the area, and in West Virginia, Virginia, and North Carolina about 10,000 workers and move them to the Northeastern and Middle Atlantic States during the year. From within the area and in Kentucky and Tennessee, about 8,400 workers to the Midwest dairy States.

The CHAIRMAN. That will not dislocate the labor supply in Kentucky and Tennessee, Governor?

Mr. TOWNSEND. We do not believe so. The source is from the Appalachian Mountains. The people that are farming there, a majority of them, are not now producing any more than they are consuming. That is one area where we do have what we call a plus labor supply. People who are not producing more than they are themselves consuming do not help the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been any recruiting in that area for industrial workers, for munitions or industrial plants?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not know that there has been recruiting, but there certainly has been a number that have left.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you offer them inducements which will compare with those offered, both as to wages and hours, by industrial plants?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Those people do not want to go to cities. They have never been in cities.

The CHAIRMAN. You think they will accept smaller wages and work longer hours rather than go to cities?

Mr. TOWNSEND. If they can take their families and be furnished a home to live in, they would prefer working on a farm. We have trained some of them in Ohio State University; we tried to train them, but they were placed before they were completely trained. After they were there about a week, some farmer would take them.

Mr. TABER. I thought you told us that about half of these folks came from the cities anyhow, in the South, whom you were taking up into this territory.

Major WALKER. These are the all-year-round hired hands that Governor Townsend is talking about.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am talking about these 8,400. I hope to put year-round hands on livestock and dairy farms.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice that you also propose to take from the same area the quota for the Corn Belt. How many do you expect to get from Kentucky and Tennessee for the Corn Belt?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is what I am talking about, the Midwest Corn Belt; the dairy area and the Corn Belt area.

The CHAIRMAN. And you said 8,400?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. According to this statistical table, that is for Midwest dairy.

In addition to that, you propose to take for the Corn Belt a further supply of 12,000 people, approximately?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That would make a total altogether of how much?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That would make a total of about 21,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The supply of labor then for the Midwest dairy section and for the Corn Belt section is all to be taken from Kentucky and Tennessee?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And they are to be taken permanently. These are year-round permanent jobs?

Mr. TOWNSEND. We hope the 21,000 will be permanent. But undoubtedly we cannot get all of them to remain permanently.

The CHAIRMAN. With the very reduced volume of labor available in Kentucky and Tennessee, now almost at a minimum, do you think you can take these 25,000 to 30,000 out of there for year-round jobs elsewhere, without affecting the local situation?

Mr. TOWNSEND. They are living in the mountain parts of the States on little plots of land, just subsistence plots. They are only producing enough for themselves, in most cases. We are hoping to induce them to go where they can do better for themselves and for the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. They will take their families with them?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Just pull up, leave the little house and go into the Corn Belt. I got a man 14 years ago out of the hills down there and he is now manager of a 500-acre farm and probably worth over $10,000; just a young fellow that had had no chance before.

The CHAIRMAN. You got that man without any Government assistance?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Why cannot that plan be followed here? What is the necessity for all this elaborate machinery and great expense?

Mr. TOWNSEND. There were probably 10 or 12 obtained the year that I got this man. We want to do this quickly. This is a serious thing. It is a part of the war effort, and it must be done in a systematic way with good organization. We doubt whether farmers themselves will know how to go about it. I am the only one in my own neighborhood that got a good man.

The CHAIRMAN. In the northern Great Plains area, how many do you expect to deliver there and from what source will you secure them?

Mr. TOWNSEND. About 1,900 will be furnished from within the area and from Texas and Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a peculiar situation. You need 1,900 men in the Great Plains area and you propose to take them away from Texas and Oklahoma. You also report that you need 400 men in Texas and Oklahoma, and you are taking men away from an area which is applying to you for labor. That is an anomaly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is a labor movement with the season, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not say so here. These are year-round laborers to be moved permanently, according to your tabulation. This says, "Number of year-round labor to be moved, March 1, 1943, to December 31, 1943."

Now, how about the Pacific Southwest?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Of course, in each case we estimate that the areas of recruitment will be from within the area and from other States. We do not confine it to those States. It is in that general area, and perhaps including other States.

The CHAIRMAN. How many permanent workers do you expect to deliver to the Pacific Southwest and from what sources?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is the Mountain States and the Pacific Northwest and the Southern Great Plains.

The CHAIRMAN. How many?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Approximately 8,700.

The CHAIRMAN. And from what source?

Mr. TOWNSEND. From within that part of the general area and the Southeast.

The CHAIRMAN. I note here under item No. 8 on this table that you propose to take men permanently and to deliver men permanently to the Pacific Northwest from the Southeast. In other words, you are taking them clear across the country, on the very longest radius that could be drawn. You are taking them from the Southeast and delivering them to the Northwest.

Could you not secure labor a little closer? The cost of transportation would be very material here, if you delivered them diagonally across continental America.

Major WALKER. That is a long way, Mr. Chairman. A larger part of that labor in those areas will be moved within the areas concerned, the Mountain States and the Pacific Northwest States.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think that must be an error, Major; surely, that is an error.

The CHAIRMAN. I am referring to your mimeographed copy, and I hardly see how that can be an error.

This table will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The table referred to is as follows:)

Number of workers proposed to be moved into each area and the general areas of recruitment

[Estimated replacements which need to be made between Mar. 1, 1943, and Dec 31, 1943]

Areas to which workers will be moved [1]	Number of year-round labor to be moved		Areas of recruitment
	Mar. 1, to July 1, 1943	July 1, to Dec. 31, 1943	
(1) Northeastern and Middle Atlantic.	4,200	5,800	Within the area and West Virginia, Virginia, and North Carolina.
(2) Midwest Dairy	3,300	5,100	Within the area and Kentucky and Tennessee.
(3) Corn Belt	4,800	7,800	Do.
(4) Northern Great Plains	800	1,100	Within the area and Texas and Oklahoma.
(5) Texas-Oklahoma	200	200	Within the area.
(6) Pacific Southwest	1,600	2,400	Within the area, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, and the Southeast.
(7) Mountain	400	400	Within the area and the Southeast.
(8) Pacific Northwest	1,500	2,000	Do.
(9) Southern Great Plains	200	200	Do.
United States, total	17,000	25,000	

[1] The following States are included in each area: (1) New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and parts of New England; (2) Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota; (3) Iowa, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri; (4) North and South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas; (5) East Texas and Oklahoma; (6) California, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada; (7) Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana; (8) Washington, Oregon, and Idaho; and (9) New Mexico and West Texas.

PER CAPITA COST OF TRANSPORTATION, SUBSISTENCE, ETC.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the per capita costs of delivering these men, dividing those up as to transportation, subsistence, medical care, hospitalization, and so forth?

Major WALKER. Transportation costs for the year-round workers, which includes their families and household goods, will be about $80 per family.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. $80?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir. The average cost of moving their families and their household goods to the new location is about $80 per family.

In addition to that, there is subsistence en route, and if they stay at a training center for some time subsistence there, which would run to about $40 per worker.

At most of these centers they have not stayed as long as we anticipated, because they made an individual deal with a farmer employer who came there. They went out very much more rapidly than we anticipated they would.

The CHAIRMAN. Your cost of transportation per capita is estimated to average what?

Major WALKER. $80, including the family.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you estimate the subsistence cost to be?

Mr. TOWNSEND. About $40.

FEEDING OF MEXICAN LABORERS

The CHAIRMAN. I notice in the Congressional Record as of February 16, 1943, a Member of Congress from this area to which we have just been referring, says that notwithstanding the fact that—

> our farmers have been unable to secure meat, eggs, and butter in some localities, yet the Farm Security Administration in California has come out with new rules and regulations governing the feeding of Mexican nationals that will be brought into the State of California to work.

He says that in this program, although our farmers are unable to secure meat and eggs—

> they are asking that the Mexicans be fed meat 6 days out of every week when the farmers in my State and men working in the shipbuilding yards and airplane manufacturing plants have not had a speck of meat on their own table for as long as 3 or 4 weeks.

Then he goes on with a program headed, "Standardization for Mexican Extra Gang Laborers," and it runs as follows:

> Butter is to be served at each meal.
>
> Bacon squares or meat in some form for breakfast six times per week and ham one time per week.
>
> Eggs should be served every morning and no limit placed on the number consumed.

That is quoted from requirements issued by the Government.

Then there appears on page 1068 of the Congressional Record mention by him of suggested menus. There is a very elaborate breakfast such as oatmeal, bacon squares, fried pinto beans, fried potatoes, sirup, hot biscuits, coffee, eggs.

> Oatmeal, bacon squares, hot cakes, syrup, hash-brown potatoes, hot biscuits, coffee, eggs.
>
> For dinner: roast beef, pinto beans, Spanish macaroni, stewed fruit, hot cornbread, tea or coffee, potatoes.

Also the seasoning is specified, there shall be plenty of seasoning, and so on.

Is that typical of the requirements that you make with reference to all of this labor that is being moved?

Major WALKER. I never heard of that menu. I never heard that mentioned before.

The CHAIRMAN. This is quoted from a circular issued by the Department. Of course, we expect you to be familiar with it.

Major WALKER. Most of the Mexicans buy their own food. Under the contracts that they have with the grower, the only thing that is specified is the maximum amount that can be charged per day for feeding them. My recollection is that the growers figured that at $1.40. That is the only thing I have ever seen about food in any of those cases.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, may I direct the Governor's attention to a statement put in the record by Mr. Elliott, of California? I happened to be on the floor. He had the original document which came from the Farm Security Administration in California.

Mr. TABER. I would like to have you get that and bring it up here to the committee.

Mr. WOODRUM. I understand also that he gave as elaborate and rigid regulations that have been promulgated respecting their housing and sanitation and health conditions which, as I recall, from a casual look at it, went away beyond anything that we have tried to provide for our industrial workers in and around the industrial plants.

The CHAIRMAN. And beyond what the employer himself and his family may enjoy.

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; away beyond. Not only that, but they are hedged in by the hours of labor that they might be employed and what not. I think, Governor, you should make a statement about that after informing yourself on it, and let the committee know something about it. I would like to know something about it. It is believed the following letter, sent to Hon. Alfred J. Elliott by Mr. Baldwin on February 20, 1943, will clarify the point raised by the committee regarding the feeding of Mexican laborers.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
February 20, 1943.

Hon. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: On February 16 you read to the House a feeding standard which had been reported to you as representing food requirements imposed on California growers by the Farm Security Administration for feeding Mexican agricultural workers brought into this country.

I was as astonished as you to hear of this reported requirement as I had no knowledge of such regulations. As a result of an immediate inquiry into this matter, I am glad to advise you that the Farm Security Administration has made no such requirement, nor even recommended such feeding regulations as those reported to you.

The document furnished to you, I learn, is one issued by the Threlkeld Commissary Co., 111 Sutter Street, San Francisco, to its field supervisors for guidance in feeding Mexican gang labor employed on track work for the Southern Pacific Railroad. No such standards have been issued by the Farm Security Administration nor have any such requirements been made.

This document came into the hands of the Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation, which recently employed Government-transported Mexican labor, as a result of their request made to a Farm Security representative for any information which would be helpful to them in providing suitable food for Mexican workers. A good many Mexican workers had at first suffered gastric disturbances from United States food, and growers have sought the advice of Mexican Government representatives and others in an effort to provide food to which the workers were accustomed and avoid the sickness and loss of work time that diets strange to them had caused.

The Threlkeld Co., which had had experience in feeding Mexican workers, provided us copies of its own feeding instructions, and a copy of this was passed on to the Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation, which has just employed about 300 Mexican workers in the Bakersfield area. There was no suggestion that this was to be a required or recommended feeding regulation and it was obvious that a number of things proposed would have to be interpreted in the light of the current food supply situation. The extent to which these suggestions were adopted was entirely within the discretion of the employer.

In order to be sure that there was no misunderstanding of this gesture on our part, Mr. Laurence I. Hewes, Farm Security regional director in San Francisco in charge of the Mexican labor program. asked the Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation for their understanding of this matter. The following letter, dated February 18, 1943, was received in reply:

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
San Francisco, Calif.
(Attention L. I. Hewes.)

GENTLEMEN: In connection with the Mexican labor procured for us by you we wish to state at this time that there has never been any attempt by the Farm Security Administration to issue a mandatory menu to be supplied to these workers and we are furnishing them with three substantial meals per day based on our own menus.

Yours very truly,

DI GIORGIO FRUIT CORPORATION,
R. S. MCKNIGHT, *Treasurer.*

In view of the serious effect that this charge can have on our efforts to provide labor for war crops in California and elsewhere, I would greatly appreciate your presenting to the membership of the House this letter which denies that any such food requirements were imposed or recommended. If there are any further questions regarding this matter, I would be very glad to answer them.

Sincerely yours,

C. B. BALDWIN, *Administrator.*

Mr. TOWNSEND. That was under the Farm Security Administration. This program we are talking about is going to be under my administration as Director of Food Production.

Mr. TABER. Is it going to be clear of this whole Farm Security set-up?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am going to use the facilities of the Farm Security Administration, because I do not want to create a new organization and duplicate one that is already in existence. I am going to use the Farm Security Administration to handle the farm-labor transportation and labor-supply centers.

Mr. TABER. It is going to be very expensive if you use their facilities, because you are going to find that their set-up is outlandish.

COST OF SUBSISTENCE EN ROUTE FOR SEASONAL LABOR

The CHAIRMAN. I see in your justification you specify that the cost of subsistence en route for seasonal labor is based on an average cost of $1 per meal per person.

Does that include only the laborer, or does that include all members of his family that are transported? Does every member of the family get $1 per meal?

Major WALKER. Yes; they would. So far we have moved practically no families. We tried to avoid moving families. In the Mexican movement, if it goes up to 50,000 workers, we probably are going to have to move a certain number of Mexican families. We were insisting, in the Mexican movement, that there should be not more than 2 nonproductive members to the family. Since the man and the wife usually work, and they have no means of leaving

their small children at home, we would probably have to move the children as well.

The CHAIRMAN. And you move a total of how many laborers?

Major WALKER. A minimum of two laborers in a family movement.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be $4 per meal for each family.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

SPECIMEN COOPERATIVE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT

The CHAIRMAN. We have had complaints from States from which labor is drawn that it dislocates entirely their supply of labor, upon which they have depended for many years; a system that has grown up slowly and upon which they must depend to produce their normal crops.

Here is a complaint from States to which they are delivered. It says that the Farm Security Administration is requiring farmers to sign contracts under which they agree to pay minimum wages and conform to standards of hours of work, housing, and so forth, before they get even consideration from F. S. A. for transportation of seasonal workers transported by Federal funds.

I wonder if you can submit to us specimen contracts which they are required to sign, as to guaranty of a minimum wage and standard of living. Do you have those with you or will you supply them?

Major WALKER. Here is one.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be included in the record.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

COOPERATIVE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT

THIS COOPERATIVE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT, made this _____ day of _____, 19____, between the United States of America, hereinafter called the "Government," and _____, of _____, State of _____, hereinafter called the "Employer."

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the Government and the Employer wish to cooperate in making agricultural workers available to alleviate the present shortage of agricultural labor and to aid in the successful prosecution of the war,

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the undertakings hereinafter stated, the Government and the Employer agree as follows:

1. The Government shall use its best efforts to recruit and transport agricultural workers for employment by the Employer, from points of origin or intermediate points in the United States or Mexico, to the destination point hereinafter stated, and, upon completion of that employment, to the points of origin, or to such intermediate points in the United States as the Government shall determine to be proper.

2. The Employer shall employ, exclusively as agricultural laborers, _____ such agricultural workers (if transported by the Government to _____, State of _____, not later than _____, 19____), for at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the workdays (each day in the week except Sunday to be considered a workday) between _____, 19____, and _____, 19____, hereinafter called the "period of employment," upon the following terms:

a. The Employer shall be required to furnish such employment to a worker hereunder only so long as the worker is ready, willing, and able to work under the supervision and direction of the Employer; but shall not require the worker to work on Sundays.

b. The Employer shall give each such worker a minimum subsistence allowance of $3 per day for each workday within said minimum of seventy-five percent (75%) of the workdays that he is not so employed; provided, however, that no

subsistence allowance shall be made for workdays in which the worker is unemployed as the result of his refusal to work or his illness or other physical incapacity.

c. A workday shall contain not less than eight hours nor more than twelve hours; provided, however, that to determine the amount of employment under paragraph 2 of this agreement, hours of work less than eight done on any day except Sunday may, if the Government consents, be added to hours of work less than eight done on any other day except Sunday, and for such purpose each ten hours of work shall be counted as a workday.

d. Work shall be paid for in lawful money of the United States Government at the end of each week of work, at not less than the prevailing wage rates within the particular area of employment; provided, however, that piece work rates, for work to be performed upon that basis, shall be set by the Employer so as to enable the workers, if of average ability, to earn not less than the prevailing hourly wage rate; provided further, that the wage rates for either hourly or piece work shall in no event be less than 30 cents per hour. The prevailing wage rates shall be conclusively determined by the Government.

e. The Employer shall pay all costs of transportation of the workers (and the members of their families transported with them by the Government to the above-specified point of destination) between said destination point and the place or places at which the workers are to perform their work, and return to said destination point.)

f. No deductions from wages shall be made for commissions, fees, or any other purpose (except as may be required by law), which shall have the effect of reducing the workers' wages below those required by paragraph 2d of this agreement.

g. The Employer shall pay to the Government, in trust for each such worker who has been transported by the Government from Mexico for employment in the United States, twenty percent (20%) of his wages, which portion of his wages each such worker will have assigned to the Government in trust, to be held or controlled and disposed of by the Government under the terms of its agreement with the worker.

h. The workers shall be entitled to the benefit and protection of all applicable child labor, compensation, and other laws and regulations of the Government and of the State or States in which the work is performed.

i. The workers shall not be required to purchase articles or services for consumption or use by them or their families at any source not of their choice.

j. The workers shall be entitled to freedom from discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin, in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order No. 8802 of the President of the United States, dated June 25, 1941.

k. The Employer shall make available to the workers and their families, without charge, such shelter facilities as are owned by the Employer and are not otherwise occupied within the period of employment.

l. The workers shall have the right to join with other workers in the election of representatives to bargain and negotiate with the Employer; provided, however, that any of the workers who have been imported by the Government from Mexico for employment shall join only with other such workers imported from Mexico, and shall elect their representatives from such workers.

m. There shall no strikes, lockouts, or stoppages of work during the period of employment. All disputes between the workers and the Employer shall be determined by mediation according to procedure prescribed by the Government.

3. The Employer shall pay to the Government, to be held and expended by it in trust, subject to the terms of this cooperative agreement, the sum of $5.00 for each such worker transported to the above-named destination point by the Government. Each payment shall be made upon demand by the Government after the arrival of the worker at the specified destination point. The Employer, at the time of the execution of this agreement, shall deposit with the Government as an advance to be applied by it to the payment of said sums, the sum of $_____. The Government shall refund to the Employer, as soon as practicable after termination of employment hereunder, such part of the sum so deposited as the Government is not entitled to under this paragraph.

4. The Government shall determine from time to time, and its determination shall be conclusive, whether the Employer has paid all sums to be paid by him hereunder, and shall have the right to pay (as subsistence allowances or otherwise) to the persons it determines to be entitled thereto, all or any part of any such sums which it determines have not been paid, in which case the Employer shall repay to the Government, upon demand by it, all sums so paid, together with interest

thereupon at the rate of six percent (6%) per annum from the date or dates of such payments by the Government, to be held and expended by the Government in trust subject to the terms of this cooperative agreement.

5. The sums paid to the Government under paragraphs 3 and 4 above shall be held by it in trust, and used and expended within and for the program (of which this agreement is a part) to provide an adequate supply and distribution of labor to produce, harvest, and process crops essential to the war effort. The Government may pool said sums with other sums so paid to it by employers for said program, and shall not be required to keep separate accounts or records therefor.

6. The Employer shall keep, upon forms to be supplied by the Government, full and complete records of the employment and wages of each worker under this agreement. Such records shall be at all times open to inspection and examination by the Government, which shall be entitled to make copies thereof. The Employer shall also file with the Government such reports concerning said employment and wages as the Government may from time to time require.

7. The Employer shall immediately furnish the Government with a performance bond in the penal sum of $_____, in the form and with a surety company approved by the Government, conditioned upon the performance by the Employer of all the terms and undertakings of this agreement and upon the prompt payment by the Employer to the workers and the Government of all sums due to them or any of them hereunder.

8. If the Government determines that the Employer has violated any of the terms or undertakings of this agreement, it may, without waiving any other remedy or course of action, deprive the Employer of the further services of the workers under this agreement.

9. All rights, privileges, and powers conferred herein by the Government shall be exercised in its behalf by the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, or his duly authorized representative.

In witness whereof, the Government and the Employer have executed this agreement as of the date first above written.

United States of America,

By _____

_____
(Official Title)

Farm Security Administration,
United States Department of Agriculture.

Witnesses:

_____ _____
(Employer)

_____ By _____

AGREEMENT ENTERED INTO BETWEEN THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE MEXICAN GOVERNMENT CONCERNING THE IMPORTATION OF MEXICAN NATIONALS FOR EMPLOYMENT AS AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

In order to effect a satisfactory arrangement whereby Mexican agricultural labor may be made available for use in the United States and at the same time provide means whereby this labor will be adequately protected while out of Mexico, the following general provisions are suggested:

(1) It is understood that Mexicans contracting to work in the United States shall not be engaged in any military service.

(2) Mexicans entering the United States as a result of this understanding shall not suffer discriminatory acts of any kind in accordance with the Executive Order No. 8802 issued at the White House June 25, 1941.

(3) Mexicans entering the United States under this understanding shall enjoy the guaranties of transportation, living expenses, and repatriation established in article 29 of the Mexican labor law.

(4) Mexicans entering the United States under this understanding shall not be employed to displace other workers, or for the purpose of reducing rates of pay previously established.

In order to implement the application of the general principles mentioned above the following specific clauses are established.

(When the word "employer" is used hereinafter it shall be understood to mean the Farm Security Administration of the Department of Agriculture of the United States of America; the word "subemployer" shall mean the owner or operator of the farm or farms in the United States on which the Mexican will be employed; the word "worker" hereinafter used shall refer to the Mexican farm laborer entering the United States under this understanding.)

CONTRACTS

(*a*) Contracts will be made between the employer and the worker under the supervision of the Mexican Government. (Contracts must be written in Spanish.)

(*b*) The employer shall enter into a contract with the subemployer, with a view to proper observance of the principles embodied in this understanding.

ADMISSION

(*a*) The Mexican health authorities will, at the place whence the worker comes, see that he meets the necessary physical conditions.

TRANSPORTATION

(*a*) All transportation and living expenses from the place of origin to destination, and return, as well as expenses incurred in the fulfillment of any requirements of a migratory nature shall be met by the employer.

(*b*) Personal belongings of the workers up to a maximum of 35 kilos per person shall be transported at the expense of the employer.

(*c*) In accord with the intent of article 29 of the Mexican Federal labor law it is expected that the employer will collect all or part of the cost accruing under (*a*) and (*b*) of transportation from the subemployer.

WAGES AND EMPLOYMENT

(*a*) (1) Wages to be paid to the worker shall be the same as those paid for similar work to other agricultural laborers in the respective regions of destination; but in no case shall this wage be less than 30 cents per hour (United States currency); piece rates shall be so set as to enable the workers of average ability to earn the prevailing wage.

(*a*) (2) On the basis of prior authorization from the Mexican Government salaries lower than those established in the previous clause may be paid those emigrants admitted into the United States as members of the family of the worker under contract and who, when they are in the field, are able also to become agricultural laborers but who, by their condition or age or sex, cannot carry out the average amount of ordinary work.

(*b*) The worker shall be exclusively employed as an agricultural laborer for which he has been engaged; any change from such type of employment shall be made with the express approval of the worker and with the authority of the Mexican Government.

(*c*) There shall be considered illegal any collection by reason of commission or for any other concept demanded of the worker.

(*d*) Work for minors under 14 years shall be strictly prohibited, and they shall have the same schooling opportunities as those enjoyed by children of other agricultural laborers.

(*e*) Workers domiciled in the migratory labor camps or at any other place of employment under this understanding shall be free to obtain articles for their personal consumption, or that of their families, wherever it is most convenient for them.

(*f*) Housing conditions, sanitary, and medical services enjoyed by workers admitted under this understanding shall be identical to those enjoyed by the other agricultural workers in the same localities.

(*g*) Workers admitted under this understanding shall enjoy as regards occupational diseases and accidents the same guaranties enjoyed by other agricultural workers under United States legislation.

(*h*) Groups of workers admitted under this understanding shall elect their own representatives to deal with the employer, but it is understood that all such representatives shall be working members of the group. The Mexican consuls in their respective jurisdiction shall make every effort to extend all possible protection to all these workers on any questions affecting them.

(*i*) For such time as they are unemployed under a period equal to 75 percent of the period (exclusive of Sundays) for which the workers have been contracted they shall receive a subsistence allowance at the rate of $3 per day.

For the remaining 25 percent of the period for which the workers have been contracted during which the workers may be unemployed they shall receive subsistence on the same bases that are established for farm laborers in the United States.

Should the cost of living rise this will be a matter for reconsideration.

The master contracts for workers submitted to the Mexican Government shall contain definite provisions for computation of subsistence and payments under this understanding.

(*j*) The term of the contract shall be made in accordance with the authorities of the respective countries.

(*k*) At the expiration of the contract under this understanding, and if the same is not renewed, the authorities of the United States shall consider illegal, from an immigration point of view, the continued stay of the worker in the territory of the United States, exception made of cases of physical impossibility.

SAVINGS FUND

(*a*) The respective agency of the Government of the United States shall be responsible for the safekeeping of the sums contributed by the Mexican workers toward the formation of their rural savings fund, until such sums are transferred to the Mexican Agricultural Credit Bank, which shall assume responsibilities for the deposit, for their safekeeping, and for their application, or, in the absence of these, for their return.

(*b*) The Mexican Government through the Banco de Credito Agricola will take care of the security of the savings of the workers to be used for payment of the agricultural implements, which may be made available to the Banco de Credito Agricola in accordance with exportation permits for shipment to Mexico with the understanding that the Farm Security Administration will recommend priority treatment for such implements.

NUMBERS

As it is impossible to determine at this time the number of workers who may be needed in the United States for agricultural labor employment, the employer shall advise the Mexican Government from time to time as to the number needed. The Government of Mexico shall determine in each case the number of workers who may leave the country without detriment to its national economy.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

It is understood that, with reference to the departure from Mexico of Mexican workers, who are not farm laborers, there shall govern in understandings reached by agencies of the respective Governments the same fundamental principles which have been applied here to the departure of farm labor.

It is understood that the employers will cooperate with such other agencies of the Government of the United States in carrying this understanding into effect whose authority under the laws of the United States are such as to contribute to the effectuation of the understanding.

Either Government shall have the right to renounce this understanding, giving appropriate notification to the other Government 90 days in advance.

This understanding may be formalized by an exchange of notes between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Mexico and the Embassy of the United States of America in Mexico.

Mexico City, the 23d of July 1942.

(Signed) E. Hidalgo,
Acting as representative of the Foreign Office,

(Signed) Abraham J. Navas,
Acting as representative of the Department of Labor and Social Provision,
Mexican Commissioners.

(Signed) J. M. McGurk,
Counselor of the American Embassy in Mexico,

(Signed) John O. Walker,
Assistant Administrator, Farm Security Administration (Department of Agriculture),

(Signed) David Meeker,
Assistant Director, Office of Agricultural War Relations (Department of Agriculture),

American Commissioners.

Major WALKER. May I also suggest that we file a copy of the Mexican Agreement for the record, because that has a marked bearing on the whole determination of contracts that have been entered into.

The CHAIRMAN. In this connection, may I say it has also been represented that the F. S. A. in order to secure these men, has frequently paid to have them released from jail, in order to transport them to other places for labor. Is that correct? Have you ever paid the cost of releasing a man from jail?

Major WALKER. I have never heard of anything of the kind.

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS OF WORKERS

The CHAIRMAN. Are these men given a medical examination before they are sent? You are not transporting diseased men?

Major WALKER. Medical examinations were given to all the Mexicans. We have not been able to do so as well for the domestic labor, because we did not have the facilities or sufficient funds. But they all should be examined. That is contemplated.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been represented that there was no preliminary medical examination, and that in practically all consignments of labor that have been made up to this time on all projects, men have been delivered to the projects and all of their expenses of recruiting and transportation paid, and when they arrived on the project they were found so diseased that they were disabled for labor purposes and instead of being used for labor, were sent to the hospital. Have you had instances of that sort?

Major WALKER. I do not remember any instances. I think it is quite possible that it is true, because we have not had physical examinations on domestic labor. However, it is contemplated to do that under this program. We do examine the Mexicans.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you transported domestic labor without medical examination?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TOWNSEND. But it is contemplated under this program to have them all given a physical examination before they are moved.

SAMPLE WORK AGREEMENT

Major WALKER. Shall we also include in the record a copy of the work agreement that the worker has to sign? We have secured extra copies of them if you would like to have them.

The CHAIRMAN. We will include that in the record.

(The agreement referred to is as follows:)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

WORK AGREEMENT

(Domestic workers)

THIS AGREEMENT, made this _____ day of _____, 19____, between the United States of America, hereinafter called the "Government" and _____, of _____, State of _____, hereinafter called the "Worker."

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the Government and the Worker mutually desire that the Worker shall be beneficially employed in the United States of America to alleviate the present shortage of agricultural labor and to aid in the successful prosecution of the war,

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of this and of the undertakings hereinafter stated, the Government and the Worker agree that:

1. The Worker shall accept transportation, food, living facilities, subsistence, and employment upon the terms set forth in this agreement; and shall execute such other agreements, vouchers, and instruments as the Government may require to effect those terms.

2. The Government, at its expense, shall:

(*a*) Transport, or arrange for the transportation of, the Worker and the members of his family named in Schedule A on the back of this agreement, all of whom (including the Worker) are herein called the "Family," and not in excess of seventy-five pounds of personal belongings for each of them, from _____, State of _____, herein called the "point of origin," to such place or places in, and within, the United States, as the Government shall determine to be suitable for the employment of the Worker, and, upon the fulfillment by the Worker of his obligations hereunder, return to the point of origin.

(*b*) Furnish, or arrange to have furnished to the Worker and the Family all necessary food, health and medical care, and other subsistence living facilities during transportation.

3. The Government shall—

(*a*) Cause the Worker to be employed as an agricultural laborer in the United States for at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the workdays (each day of the week except Sunday to be considered a workday) between the day after the Worker's arrival at the original point of destination in the United States and _____ 19____, hereinafter called the "period of employment"; or, in the absence of such employment, make the Worker a minimum subsistence allowance of $3.00 per day for each workday within said minimum of seventy-five percent (75%) of the workdays that he is not so employed; provided, however, that no subsistence allowance shall be made for workdays in which the Worker is unemployed as a result of his refusal to work or his illness or other physical incapacity. The amount of such subsistence allowance, if any, shall be computed and the payment thereof shall be made at the end of the period of employment.

(*b*) In the event of need as determined by the Government, furnish necessary food, shelter, health and medical care, and other subsistence living facilities during periods of unemployment occurring within the period of employment.

4. Employment under this agreement shall be upon the following terms:

(*a*) The Worker shall do all work required of him by his employer or employers hereunder during the period of employment in a good and workmanlike manner under the supervision and direction of such employer or employers, but shall not be required to work on Sundays.

(*b*) A workday shall contain not less than eight hours nor more than twelve hours; provided, however, that to determine the amount of employment under paragraph 3 (*a*) above, the Government may, in its discretion, add hours of work less than eight done on any day except Sunday to hours of work less than eight done on any other day except Sunday, and for such purpose each ten hours of work shall be counted as a workday.

(*c*) Work shall be paid for in lawful money of the Government at the end of each week of work, at not less than the prevailing wage rates within the particular area of employment; provided, however, that piece work rates, for work to be performed upon that basis, shall be set, so as to enable the Worker, if of average ability, to earn not less than the prevailing hourly wage rate; provided further that the wage rates for either hourly or piece work shall in no event be less than 30 cents per hour.

(*d*) No deductions from wages shall be made for commissions, fees, or any other purpose (except as may be required by law), which shall have the effect of reducing the Worker's wages below those required by paragraph 4 (*c*) above.

(*e*) The Worker shall be employed exclusively as an agricultural worker.

(*f*) The Worker shall be entitled to the benefit and protection of all applicable child labor, compensation, and other laws and regulations of the Government and of the State or States in which the work is performed.

(*g*) The Worker shall not be required to purchase articles or services for consumption or use by him or the Family at any source not of his choice.

(*h*) The Worker shall be entitled to freedom from discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin, in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order No. 8802 of the President of the United States, dated June 25, 1941.

(*i*) Food, shelter, health, and medical services, and other living facilities provided for the Worker and the Family by the Government or any employer shall meet reasonable minimum standards approved by the Government.

(*j*) The Worker shall have the right to join with other workers under agreements similar to this agreement in the election of representatives to deal with employers of agricultural labor.

(*k*) There shall be no strikes, lockouts, or stoppages of work during the period of employment. All disputes between the Worker and his employer or employers shall be determined by mediation according to procedure prescribed by the Government.

5 If the Government determines that the Worker is unable or unwilling to work as required by this agreement, or otherwise has violated any of the terms hereof, this agreement may forthwith and without notice be terminated by the Government; provided, however, that, if the agreement is terminated because of the Worker's inability as the result of illness or other physical incapacity, the Worker and the Family shall be entitled to return transportation to their point of origin in accordance with paragraphs 2 (*a*) and 2 (*b*) above.

6. All rights, privileges, and powers herein conferred upon the Government shall be exercised by the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, or his duly authorized representative.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Work Agreement has been executed as of the date first above written.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

By _____

_____
(Official Title)

Farm Security Administration,
United States Department of Agriculture.

Witnesses:

_____ _____
(Worker)
_____

The CHAIRMAN. We will also include in the record your tabulation showing costs of farm labor transportation, including subsistence en route, subsistence, health protection, medical care, and supervision.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

Farm labor transportation	1944	1943
Transportation costs:		
Seasonal labor	$11,451,000	$5,566,000
Year-round labor	2,000,000	1,360,000
Subsistence en route:		
Seasonal labor	2,569,500	1,210,000
Year-round labor	1,000,000	680,000
Subsistence, health protection and medical care	7,842,000	3,322,000
Supervision	2,018,826	901,538
Total	26,881,326	13,039,538

The transportation costs for the seasonal labor provide for 110,000 persons in 1943 to be transported an average of 2,300 miles at 2.2 cents per mile or $50.60 each. For 1944 it provides for 240,000 to be transported. Of this number, it is estimated that approximately 75,000 previously transported may not have returned to their points of origin. This number, therefore, will be transported only an additional 1,000 miles at 2.2 cents per mile or $22 each. The other 165,000 will be transported 2,700 miles at 2.2 cents per mile or $59.40 each.

The transportation costs for the year-round labor provide for 17,000 farm laborers in 1943 and 25,000 in 1944 and their families and household goods to be moved to their new location at an average cost of $80 per family.

The cost of subsistence en route for the seasonal labor is based on an average of 11 meals each at an average cost of $1 per meal per person for 1943 and an average of 13.3 meals at the same average cost of $1 per meal for 1944 for 165,000 and 5 meals for the 75,000.

The cost of subsistence en route including subsistence at training centers for year-round labor is based on an average of $40 per worker and family for both 1943 and 1944.

Subsistence, health protection, and medical care are based on an average of approximately $26 per person in 1943 and approximately $30 in 1944.

STATEMENT OF TRANSPORTATION COSTS

The CHAIRMAN. How will the transportation be furnished, by cash allowance to each worker, or will it be paid for by the Department? We are told that in some of these instances laborers have been required to report, and that they have reported, and that after they have reported there was no transportation available for them, and they have had to wait for several days before transportation could be provided.

Major WALKER. They are moved on Government transportation requests and there have been some delays in some cases due to the Army having a sudden troop movement that took up all of the railroad equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is cash given to the worker to pay for his transportation, or is it paid by the Government?

Major WALKER. The Government pays for the transportation. We have had delays in transporting this farm labor. For instance, after all of the arrangements had been made for the cars and trains to take these people to their destination the Army has had some unexpected troop movement, and we had to take a secondary position to the Army, and in those cases we have had to wait a day or two.

The CHAIRMAN. Who pays for their subsistence during the time they are waiting?

Major WALKER. In some cases we have sent them back home and reassembled them later, and in others we paid the subsistence while they were waiting for the train.

The CHAIRMAN. While they are being supported by Government subsistence being supplied for them, do they receive cash to take care of their food requirements, or is that done en masse?

Major WALKER. It is done both ways. While en route the railroad has put on a certain number of dining cars in some instances. In other cases they stopped and obtained meals at a way station, and in other cases they have purchased box lunches for them.

ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL FOR TRANSPORTATION OF FARM LABOR

The CHAIRMAN. What personnel are you using in project No. 1? In the green sheets under project No. 1, farm labor transportation, apparently you have 20 persons employed in the Department, and 1,018 employed in the field, making a total of 1,038 required for this one project.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. At a total cost per annum for personnel of how much?

Major WALKER. The cost is about $2,000,000 for the year.

Mr. TABER. What do these people do, or have not you any idea yet?

The CHAIRMAN. In round figures, the 1,038 people will cost you about $2,000,000 a year. They supervise your transportation?

Major WALKER. They administer the transportation of workers; yes, sir.

FARM LABOR CENTERS OR CAMPS

(See p. 29)

The CHAIRMAN. Now, under project No. 2, you have your labor camps. How many camps will be operated?

Major WALKER. Three hundred and forty-five.

The CHAIRMAN. What will be their capacity?

Major WALKER. 122,500.

The CHAIRMAN. And at what cost?

Major WALKER. Approximately $4,700,000.

The CHAIRMAN. What will be the expense of the operation of these camps per capita of workers, and what will the workers pay for the use of these camps?

Major WALKER. I would like to furnish a break-down of the charges.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not have it but will supply it for the record?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Also show what the total receipts from the camps will be.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If you will, show us, then, what will be the expense of operation per capita of workers housed, first, and, second, what the workers will pay for the use of these camps, and, third, what the total receipts for the camps will be.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

The expense of operation per capita of persons housed is $50 per annum. This is based on the capacity being 122,500 persons at any one time. A larger number of different persons will, of course, be housed during a full year because as some persons leave additional ones will occupy the same facilities.

The anticipated rates per unit to be charged the occupants of these camps for certain typical types of shelters are as follows:

Prefabricated demountable shelters	$1.50 per week per unit.
Tents	1.00 per week per unit.

The annual receipts which we estimate will be received for the rental of the center facilities is $1,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. You can tell us now, I suppose, without waiting, what disposition will be made of these receipts. Are they put into a revolving fund, or do they go into the Treasury?

Major WALKER. They go into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. They are covered back into the Treasury?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And they are not available to you again for reuse?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No, sir, not for reuse.

The CHAIRMAN. Now you expect to build or furnish 250 camps, and you expect to get 300 sites. Some of these are mobile camps, I understand?

Major WALKER. All of the new ones will be mobile camps.

The CHAIRMAN. At a cost of $12,750,000 for the building and furnishing of the 250 camps and 300 sites?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes, sir.

TYPICAL LABOR CENTER OR CAMP

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the committee will look at the break-down of a typical labor center. Will you just outline briefly your break-down here of a typical labor center? And at this point we will insert this break-down on the development and construction cost of a typical labor center.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

(The break-down referred to is as follows:)

Development and construction cost of typical labor center

	50 units, semi-mobile; 25 units, tent units	Extra site,[1] to be used for tents only
1 mess hall and utility building	$5,000	$5,000
25 duplex demountable shelters	17,200	
1 manager's shelter	800	800
1 nursery shelter	800	800
1 nurse and infirmary shelter	800	800
1 staff shelter	800	800
4 privy shelters	1,600	1,600
25 tent platforms	1,250	
150 tent platforms		7,500
4 service units	800	800
1 water system	2,900	2,900
1 sewer system	1,200	1,200
1 electric system	1,200	1,200
1 road system	800	800
1 telephone system	100	100
Duck boards	200	200
Flagpole drying yards	500	500
25 tents, at $50 each	1,250	
Furnishings:		
200 single and double mattress ticks	400	
200 blankets	800	
100 double beds	1,000	
100 single beds	800	
75 stoves for shelters	750	
75 chairs and tables for shelters	750	
Extra tables and benches	300	
Total	42,000	25,000

[1] To provide for nonmobile equipment and utility systems for each of 50 sites in addition to the 250 complete centers.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be sufficient to include this. You may tell us what personnel will be required for this project No. 2.

Major WALKER. 1,685 for the 345 camps.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is a total of 1,685 for the 345 camps.

The CHAIRMAN. What does that personnel consist of? You have green sheets of that?

Mr. SIEGEL. The green sheets for project No. 2 show in detail the list of personnel.

Mr. TABER. May I ask a question right at this point, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Will this program, with all of these projects, provide employment for all of those that are on the roll of the Farm Security Administration now, in every set-up? That is very important. None of them will have to go to work anywhere; they can all get on the roll if you have all of this money?

Major WALKER. All of the personnel that are already working in the existing camps?

Mr. TABER. Will it not take care of all of those that are now on the rolls of the Farm Security Administration? All of the personnel that is now on the roll?

Mr. TOWNSEND. New personnel will have to be provided for all of the new centers.

Mr. TABER. But all of your present personnel in the 95 camps will be continued on.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is right.

Mr. TABER. All of your Farm Security Administration personnel will remain on the roll?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is the plan, sir, for the farm-labor centers.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the total cost of these 1,685 people?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Approximately $2,700,000.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice you are spending $42,000 for each camp, merely as a beginning, in this typical break-down here. How much of that is capital expenditure, and how much of that is nonrecurring?

Major WALKER. That is all capital expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. It is all capital expenditure?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much land are you acquiring for this purpose? You are asking for $25,000 for tent sites alone.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No land will be purchased; it will be leased.

The CHAIRMAN. It states here that this is for tent sites only. How about the land for your permanent units?

Mr. SIEGEL. These are all mobile camps.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes, sir; these are all to be mobile camps. None of these will be permanent.

The CHAIRMAN. You acquire no real estate in fee simple for these sites at all?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a break-down here of $42,000 for semi-mobile and tent units, and then you have $25,000 here, "extra site to be used for tents only." What is the distinction? What is the distinction between them?

Mr. SIEGEL. Those are the utility systems and other items of capital investment that cannot be moved.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you do have some permanent real estate?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You say they are not to be moved?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you just told us that you had no real estate, that all of these were mobile units, and that you had no land in fee simple.

Mr. SIEGEL. I understood your question to be as to land. This estimate does not contemplate the purchase of land.

The CHAIRMAN. What is this $25,000? You have here "extra site to be used for tents only, $25,000." How is that to be spent, and what for?

Major WALKER. It covers the mess hall that cannot be moved, and shelter for manager, and shelter for nurse and nursery shelter, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. You own that land where those buildings are that cannot be moved?

Major WALKER. No, sir; we do not own the land. We reserve the right to remove the facilities at the completion of the occupancy.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that include the site?

Major WALKER. No, only the facilities; the site does not cost that.

The CHAIRMAN. What will the sites cost you? You say in this column, "site." Now, we take it for granted that is the cost of the site or includes the cost. You should modify that heading.

Mr. SIEGEL. The provision for leasing sites is under the item operation and maintenance of the farm labor supply centers. The cost shown in this schedule is simply the cost of the equipment needed for the centers themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, is this $25,000 total here a part of the $42,000 shown in the first column, or is that in addition to the $42,000 in the first column?

Major WALKER. That is in addition to the $42,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Your total cost, then, is $67,000?

Major WALKER. No, sir. You see, we have a camp site that we set up. We lease the land and set up a camp on that. That is $42,000. We may have two or three other sites that a large part of this equipment will be moved to, and the expenditures to make that site usable is $25,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That is hardly clear. First you say $25,000 in addition to the $42,000, and then you say that is not $67,000.

Major WALKER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You say in one column that the extra site is to be used for tents only, and then you say it is not for the site. Just below this, where you insert this in the record, we will ask you to clarify it. (See p. 59.)

Major WALKER. There are 250 of the sites that cost $42,000, and there are 50 of these that cost $25,000. These sites are the ones that other materials from these will be moved to.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not very clear. At least it is not set out in your table here. Please make that clear when you submit your record.

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes, sir.

RECRUITMENT AND PLACEMENT OF LOCAL LABOR

The CHAIRMAN. Under your project No. 3, recruitment and placement of local labor, you are asking for $3,732,500. How do you expect to recruit those local women and youths?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have Mr. Wilson here from the Extension Service, who is going to assume responsibility under my administration for this recruiting through the United States Office of Education and the public schools, the State Extension Service directors, and county agents; and I would be glad to have Mr. Wilson give you a general outline of that.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wilson, this money is to be spent to get women to do men's work, work that was previously done by men?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is work that men working on farms have done, at least, heretofore; and you now propose to bring women in from outside of farms, presumably from the city, to do this work that the men formerly did?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, tell us how you will recruit them.

Mr. WILSON. The nonfarm youth and the nonfarm women are separate programs.

The CHAIRMAN. Discuss them separately.

Mr. WILSON. The youth program is a continuation of the experiments that were conducted in various parts of the country last year, such as the Volunteer Land Corps in Vermont, the Y. M. C. A. Camp project in California, the Berks County, Pa., school project, and the like, where nonfarm youth, mostly those 15, 16, and 17 years of age, were recruited through schools and placed on farms for appropriate

farm work. Those experiments sufficiently demonstrated the practicability of greatly expanding such programs for 1943.

The CHAIRMAN. Just how efficient do you find this class of labor? There was a report published recently in which it said that these boys were very lovable sort of youngsters, and the man speaking said he always took a few on his farm, said he always had a few of them on his farm, now, but that he did not get much work out of them.

Mr. WILSON. There were many mistakes made in 1942 because of the methods of recruiting and placement used by the various volunteer organizations. As a result of which the youngsters were not properly selected. But where they were properly selected, given a certain amount of preparatory training, intelligently placed with farmers, and reasonable supervision provided the results were quite satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. Now tell us about the women.

Mr. WILSON. Well, in a similar way, in 1942, the American Women's Volunteer Service in California, and also here in the District of Columbia, the Connecticut Women's Land Army, and the Maine Women's Land Service had successful experience in recruiting and placing women for farm work.

The CHAIRMAN. Take those in the District of Columbia for example. How did you mobilize them; by advertisement, or circulars, or through social organizations?

Mr. WILSON. That was all handled by the American Women's Volunteer Service in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. How many women were recruited?

Mr. WILSON. I believe about 300.

The CHAIRMAN. They were residents of the District of Columbia?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir; very largely.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did they work, and what did they do?

Mr. WILSON. They worked in Virginia and West Virginia, picking apples and shucking corn.

The CHAIRMAN. How was their cost of transportation provided for?

Mr. WILSON. They paid their own.

The CHAIRMAN. They paid for their own transportation?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir; and they received the going wage for the work that they did.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they make their own contracts as to rates of pay?

Mr. WILSON. That is right, and they received the going wage.

The CHAIRMAN. And they provided their own subsistence?

Mr. WILSON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. About what was the average length of time these women worked?

Mr. WILSON. They worked mostly on Saturday afternoons, and Sundays, some work for longer periods.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no record of the number of barrels of apples handled over the week end?

Mr. WILSON. I have seen such a report from the A. W. V. S. on that, but I do not have the information here. There was sufficient experience last year to indicate that some kind of a modification of the English Women's Land Army might be applicable in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you say they worked Saturday and Sunday, or Saturday afternoon and Sunday?

Mr. WILSON. Saturday afternoon and Sunday.

The CHAIRMAN. About what percentage of an average man's work, one accustomed to farm work, would these women handle?

Mr. WILSON. I do not believe there have been any figures put out on that in this country, but I understand careful records were kept of it in England, I believe they did about three-quarters of a man's work on the average. On certain types of work they did as much, and on certain other types of work not quite so much.

VICTORY FARM VOLUNTEERS

The CHAIRMAN. I notice in your justifications, "Victory farm volunteers," made up of youths from cities, and that 200,000 of them may be recruited. For this purpose you provide $1,800,000. I take it for granted that goes for the recruitment, training, placement, transportation, and subsistence of these boys. In the first place, how do you get hold of these boys?

Mr. WILSON. We will recruit them very largely through schools. We have developed, in cooperation with the Office of Education, a comprehensive plan for the handling of this program, which has been approved by Commissioner Studebaker and by Dr. Spanton of Vocational Education, Director M. L. Wilson, and Major Walker, of the Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the average of these boys?

Mr. WILSON. As a rule, 16 or 17 years old, and they may drop down to 15 in certain cases.

The CHAIRMAN. What character of training do you give them?

Mr. WILSON. It is contemplated that it will be very largely orientation training through schools, in order to give them an understanding of what farm work and farm life are like, also what living in the country is like. We hope that it will also be possible to take them out on week ends to farms near the school, such as was done at the McDonogh School near Baltimore last year.

Mr. O'NEAL. And you are cooperating with the Department of Education on that?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

WOMEN'S LAND ARMY

The CHAIRMAN. You allocate $150,000 from this proposed appropriation for the women's land army?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir. That is very largely an exploratory type of program.

The CHAIRMAN. It is experimental?

Mr. WILSON. It is exploratory. We expect to develop a practical working plan so that if the labor situation becomes more and more critical as the war continues we will be in a position to utilize larger and larger numbers of nonfarm women for essential farm work.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

The CHAIRMAN. For the Federal administration and supervision of the local labor mobilization, the Victory farm volunteer and this women's land army you expect to spend $129,006, and for the State

administration and supervision you expect to spend $522,799. How do you expect to disburse those funds? How are they to be expended?

Mr. WILSON. You mean the fiscal arrangement?

The CHAIRMAN. Summarize the statement on pages 7, 8, and 9, under project 3, on that. I believe I will put those pages in the record, at this point.

(The pages referred to are as follows:)

PROJECT 3. MOBILIZATION OF LOCAL LABOR RESOURCES, NONFARM YOUTH, AND NONFARM WOMEN FOR FARM LABOR

(*d*) Federal and (*e*) State administration and supervision:

	Last 4 months, fiscal year 1943	First 6 months, fiscal year 1944
Objective: To provide Federal and State administration and supervision necessary to outline plans and procedures for the establishment and operation of a program to recruit and place local labor and to utilize nonfarm youth and nonfarm women, to augment the farm labor supply	$258, 754	$393, 051
The following tabulation shows the approximate amounts estimated for obligation for the administration and supervision of this emergency program during the years indicated:		
(*d*) Federal administration and supervision	52, 424	76, 582
(*e*) State administration and supervision	206, 330	316, 469
Total	258, 754	393, 051

The problem and its significance.—Capable leadership by the Department of Agriculture is essential to the orderly development and operation of a wartime program for meeting the labor requirements for 1943 agricultural production through the complete mobilization of the available labor in the towns, villages, and cities of each county for work in the local farming area, and to mobilize the nonfarm youth and nonfarm women of the Nation for effective year-round, summer period, and other crop-season farm labor. Arrangements must be made for short-period intensive training in specific farm skills for labor inexperienced in farming. City youth and women will also need orientation training and a certain amount of physical conditioning to prepare them for work on farms and life in rural areas. The over-all approach must be one of meeting war demands in a practical way. The mobilization of the local nonfarm labor resources and the programs for utilizing nonfarm youth and women for farm labor should be organized for the duration of the war—not for a single year. It should be thought of neither as a means of providing farmers with cheap, seasonal labor, nor as a means of providing city youth and women with an enjoyable vacation in the country at little expense. It is to provide a mechanism for city youth and women to perform a worth-while wartime service and for farmers and local nonfarm women, men, and youth to discharge a wartime obligation. The byproducts of educational development of youth and improved city-country understanding may be significant beyond measure, and yet for the war period they must be considered of secondary rather than primary importance. The utilization of city youth for farm labor involves organized promotion of the idea among city youth; the selection of promising volunteers; and their training, placement, and supervision. It also involves promotion of the idea among farmers, the selection of suitable farms and farm homes, and a certain amount of supervision of the farmers taking such city young people. The utilization of woman power of cities for essential farm work requires State administration and supervision to guide city women into suitable types of farm work and to facilitate their ready acceptance in farm homes and rural communities. The national program for the recruitment and placement of local labor and for the use of nonfarm youth and women for farm labor should be modified to fit the organizational structure existing within the State. It will also be necessary to arrange for the cooperation of these public agencies and private groups which can materially assist in the establishment and operation of the program in such a manner as to render the largest possible service in meeting the farm-labor problem. State extension farm-labor representatives will need to adopt the national program to

insure proper integration and full utilization of the existing State and county extension organization, including the neighborhood leader system of complete farm coverage.

Plan of work.—A Federal technical staff will be required in the Department to develop, nationally, plans and procedures and to assist the States in the promotion, organization, and administration of the emergency farm-labor program including local labor recruitment and placement of nonfarm youth and women from cities for farm labor. The Federal Extension Service will enter into cooperative relationship with the State extension service, assist in the selection of State extension farm-labor representatives, and in other ways maintain appropriate standards for the conduct of these programs.

In each State qualified persons will be employed in cooperation with the State extension service to have general direction of the emergency farm labor program. They will work in close cooperation with the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission and the State department of education, promote interest in the city schools, and assist with arrangements for the selection and training of prospective farm workers. Also, they will promote interest among farmers, assist county agents in selecting labor assistant agents, and see that the work in the counties is carried on in accordance with Federal and State plans and policies.

Financial requirements.—The following will be required to carry out the direction of this activity:

	Last 4 months fiscal year 1941	6 months fiscal year 1944
Personnel, District of Columbia:		
1 head agriculturist, at $6,500	$6,500	$6,500
4 principal agriculturists, at $5,600	22,400	22,490
5 senior agriculturists, at $4,600	23,000	23,000
4 agriculturists, at $3,850	15,200	15,200
2 associate agriculturists, at $3,200	6,400	6,400
1 assistant agriculturist, at $2,600	2,600	2,600
1 senior clerk, at $2,000	2,000	2,000
4 clerk-stenographers, at $1,800	7,200	7,200
3 senior stenographers, at $1,620	4,860	4,860
2 junior clerk-typists, at $1,440	2,880	2,880
1 under clerk, at $1,260	1,260	1,230
Total personnel, District of Columbia, 28	94,300	94,300
Deduct delay in filling new positions and lapses	−62,866	−39,294
Net permanent personnel, District of Columbia	34,434	55,006
Temporary employees, departmental	5,140	6,076
All personal services, departmental	36,574	61,082
Temporary personnel, field:		
State representatives in charge of extension farm labor	57,600	100,800
Assistant State representatives in charge of Victory farm volunteers and women's land army	51,200	69,600
Clerks	36,000	61,000
Total, temporary personnel, field	144,800	253,400
Total, District of Columbia and field	141,374	314,442
Other expenses:		
Travel	42,500	46,969
Communications	5,480	7,100
Printing	11,640	9,700
Other contractual services (mimeographing)	9,360	7,800
Supplies and materials	8,000	6,800
Equipment	400	200
Total other expenses, District of Columbia and field	77,350	75,569
Total estimate	256,754	393,051

COUNTY MOBILIZATION OF FARM LABOR

Mr. WILSON. On this question of the mobilization of the labor within a county available for farm work we will establish in each of approximately 3,000 counties an emergency farm-labor center through which farmers will make their requests for farm labor and where

there will be a record kept of all of the labor available in the county for farm work.

We anticipate that in about 2,100 of those counties where there are a sufficient number of farmers employing labor, and employing a sufficient volume of it, it will be necessary to provide additional personnel in the county extension office to handle that work.

In addition to the personnel in the county offices there will be local farm placement people employed in the various small towns and communities of the county to take care of local mobilization of farm labor and to make arrangements for its use on nearby farms.

We have made a careful analysis of this, State by State, and anticipate that about 6,000 months of such temporary assistance will be required. The cost of such local farm labor representatives will be about $900,000. There will be travel, of course, for those field assistants, some allowance for telephone and telegraph service, and necessary supplies.

INVESTIGATION OF FARM WAGE RATES

The CHAIRMAN. Pass on to project 4, investigation of farm wage rates. You estimate that $96,895 should be spent for this purpose. What authority does the Secretary of Agriculture have over farm wages or rates of pay?

Major WALKER. He has none, except the authority that was given to him by Mr. Byrnes, to let farm wages rise, with the authority to stop the rise when he thought they had gone high enough.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you put into the record at this point the order under which that authority is created?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Put the ruling in the record.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

(The order is as follows:)

PART 4001. WAGES AND SALARIES

MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

By virtue of the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and particularly by the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes" (Public Law, 729, 77th Cong.), the following amendments to the regulations promulgated by the Director of Economic Stabilization, with the approval of the President, dated October 27, 1942 (7 F. R. 8748), are hereby promulgated:

1. § 4001.1 is amended by adding the following paragraphs thereto:

§ 4001.1 Definitions. * * *

(k) The terms "approval by the Secretary of Agriculture" and "determination by the Secretary of Agriculture" shall, except as may be provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary, include an approval or determination by an agent or agents of the Secretary duly authorized to perform such act.

(l) The term "agricultural labor" shall mean persons working on farms and engaged in producing agricultural commodities whose salary or wage payments are not in excess of $2,400 per annum. The Secretary of Agriculture may by regulation issue such interpretations of this term as he finds necessary.

2. The following sections are added immediately following § 4001.5 and preceding § 4001.6:

§ 4001.5 Rules and regulations of commissioners. * * *

§ 4001.5a Authority of the Secretary of Agriculture. Notwithstanding the provisions of §§ 4001.2, 4001.4, 4001.6, and 4001.7, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to determine whether any salary or wage payments to agricultural labor are made in contravention of the Act or any rulings, orders or

regulations promulgated thereunder: Provided, however, That the provisions hereof shall not be construed to affect the authority of the National War Labor Board under the provisions of Executive Order No. 9017 (7 F. R. 237) as extended by Section 1, Title III of Executive Order No. 9250 (7 F. R. 7871, 7873). Any such determination by the Secretary shall be conclusive upon all Executive Departments and agencies of the Government in determining the costs or expenses of an employer for the purpose of any law or regulations, either heretofore or hereafter enacted or promulgated, including the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 or any maximum price regulation thereof, or for the purpose of calculating deductions under the revenue laws of the United States, or for the purpose of determining costs or expenses under any contract made by or on behalf of the United States. Any determination of the Secretary made pursuant to the authority conferred on him shall be final and shall not be subject to review by The Tax Court of the United States or by any court in any civil proceedings.

§ 4001.5b Wage and salary increases for agricultural labor. Considering that the general level of salaries and wages for agricultural labor is substandard, that a wide disparity now exists between salaries and wages paid labor in agriculture and salaries and wages paid labor in other essential war industries, and that the retention and recruitment of agricultural labor is of prime necessity in supplying the United Nations with needed foods and fibers, and in order to correct and adjust these gross inequities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, no increases in wages and salaries of agricultural labor shall, notwithstanding any other provision of any rules, orders or regulations under the Act of October 2, 1942, be deemed in violation of the Act or of any rules, orders or regulations thereunder, unless and until the Secretary of Agriculture determines and gives public notice of his determination that, with respect to areas, crops, classes of employers, or otherwise, increases in salaries or wages for agricultural labor may no longer be made without the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

§ 4001.5c Wage and salary decreases for agricultural labor. No employer shall decrease wages or salaries paid to agricultural labor below the highest salary rate or wage paid for such work between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942, without the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

§ 4001.5d Rules, orders and regulations of the Secretary. The Secretary of Agriculture may make such rulings and issue such orders or regulations as he deems necessary to enforce or otherwise carry out the provisions of the regulations in this part.

3. § 4001.10 (a) is amended in the following particular:

§ 4001.10 Effect of unlawful payments. (a) The phrase "the Board or the Commissioner, as the case may be," is amended to read "the Board, the Commissioner, or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be."

4. § 4001.14 is amended in the following particular:

§ 4001.14 Territories and possessions. The phrase "The Board and the Commissioner" is amended to read "The Board, the Commissioner or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be,".

5. Nothing herein shall be interpreted to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from utilizing any other authority now or hereafter vested in him to insure an adequate supply of agricultural labor through salary or wage stabilization and otherwise to secure agricultural production necessary for the effective prosecution of the war through programs of procurement, transportation, distribution, housing, medical care, price support, or otherwise.

(Pub. Law 729, 77th Cong.; E. O. 9250, 7 F. R. 7871).

JAMES F. BYRNES,
Economic Stabilization Director.

Approved:
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any ceiling or top, up to this time, on farm wages?

MAJOR WALKER. No, sir; he has established no ceiling on farm wages.

The CHAIRMAN. He has not?

Major WALKER. No. sir.

Mr. TOWNSEND. And there is no floor, either.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any in contemplation; do you expect to put any on?

Major WALKER. Well, because of the situation in Florida it looked for a while as though something would have to be done in regard to the wage situation in Florida among dairy workers.

Mr. TABER. Do you mean in Florida, or all over?

Major WALKER. No, sir; this was particularly in Florida.

Mr. TABER. Entirely in Florida?

Major WALKER. Yes; there it looked for a while as if something would have to be done, because the wages paid for certain commodities were getting so far apart that it was seriously affecting the ability to get even local workers to work on other crops that were unable to pay anything like the price that was being paid, for example, on green beans, at the time.

The CHAIRMAN. You have placed no ceiling on farm wages?

Major WALKER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been a minimum established by order or agreement?

Major WALKER. There is no floor by agreement, except under the Mexican agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. Then why do you start this? Here is $100,000 being spent here to investigate farm wages. Why is that required?

Major WALKER. There are two things that enter into that. The first one is, in contracting with people to move, it is necessary to tell them what the prevailing wage rate is. Public hearings are held before the prevailing wage rate is established for the particular commodity for which labor is being selected.

Mr. TOWNSEND. And in particular areas.

The CHAIRMAN. I see your request here for personnel, 17 in the Department and 24 in the field. That is, you will require a total of 41 people for these studies. How much of a survey could 41 people make?

Mr. TOWNSEND. They will hold hearings in specific areas which are called to their attention as a result of conditions that developed locally.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be sort of a spot-check?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What has been the trend of farm wages; has it been up or down, or has it changed materially in either direction?

Major WALKER. They have tended up, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are holding farm prices, I believe, under ceilings now, and what are not already under ceilings you expect to put under ceilings. If you do not raise the farm prices, how can you raise farm wages? If you raise farm wages, do you expect, coincidentally, to raise farm prices?

Major WALKER. This would not involve any actual raising of farm wages, because the Secretary has no authority to raise them.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the purpose of the study, then?

Major WALKER. To find out what the prevailing wages are for that commodity, or for the particular crops, in different areas, in determining the movement of labor from one place to the other.

The CHAIRMAN. You are planning to have these men work at the current farm wages, are you, at the prevailing wages?

Major WALKER. Within an individual locality. That is what we have always done. We have simply found out what the prevailing wage was and made agreements on that basis.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose, after you make these studies and spend $100,000 for them, you develop the fact that the farmers cannot pay the wages necessary to bring these men in from the outside, and you have to offer sufficient wages to induce these men to come from the city to the farm, and you determine, after you have investigated the matter, that the prices offered by the farmer are insufficient to attract men to the farm; what steps do you propose to take then?

Mr. TOWNSEND. The natural result, Mr. Chairman, if the prevailing wage in the area to which we are trying to take people is not sufficient to attract them there from where we expect to get them we will not get them.

The CHAIRMAN. We will have spent all of this money and be just where we started?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Obviously.

FARM WORK SIMPLIFICATION

The CHAIRMAN. Passing to project No. 5, farm jobs simplification, you request $128,431 for this purpose. I just do not quite understand that title. What do you propose to do with that $128,000?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Braum, who has charge of that particular work, is here, Mr. Chairman, and I think he can answer your question.

Mr. BRAUM. Industry has used time and motion study and work simplification and similar methods to increase the effectiveness of their laborers to a very considerable amount. Industry has been able to hire trained engineers and trained experts to go in and work with those people. There has never in this country been an opportunity to give the farmers the same information that industry has had. One reason for this is that there never has been an acute shortage of labor on American farms. There has been a little work done by some of the agricultural colleges in this country that indicates that we can raise the production of laborers a considerable amount by better methods.

As an indication of the appeal of farm work simplification, the general educational board of Rockefeller Foundation became so interested in this particular project that they appropriated private money in the amount of $87,400 to Purdue University under the direction of Dr. E. C. Young, dean of the graduate school, to use this money to work with a number of land-grant colleges, probably not all of them, to do a number of basic studies to make the information secured available through the Extension Service and land-grant colleges. Work has already started at Cornell, Purdue, Minnesota, Nebraska, Illinois, and Colorado.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. When was that made?

Mr. BRAUM. That grant was made on the 3rd day of December, 1942, with the understanding that it nearly all be used in 1943.

Farm-work simplification has been used in some of the other countries to a much better advantage than it has in this country. The whole basis of work simplification ties back into Frederick Taylor's work, which was translated into German by Dr. Seedorf.

The CHAIRMAN. I still do not quite understand what is meant by job simplification. Give us something concrete on it. Give us some illustration.

Mr. BRAUM. In that connection I would like to give you an illustration that was brought to may attention. Recently a farmer

friend out in Kansas wrote me for some other information, and I sent him some mimeographed materials, copies of which I have here.

The CHAIRMAN. On what subject?

Mr. BRAUM. He wrote me on another subject, but when I answered his letter I included some farm-work-simplification material, and I would like to put his letter into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. We would not have space for that, but give us in your own words briefly what he said.

Mr. BRAUM. His reaction was that he said work simplification is what I have been looking for for years.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what we are looking for right now. We would like to have this $128,000 expenditure simplified so that the committee can understand it.

Mr. TABER. Yes, give us an idea of some of the things that either your work or somebody else's work on this has accomplished, and what you have in mind that might be accomplished as the result of the study.

Mr. BRAUM. Roland Barrett, working at Amherst, Mass., decreased the time for packing or crating asparagus from 65 minutes a crate to 26 minutes per crate. He decreased the time on carrots from 35 minutes per crate to 18 minutes per crate. On beets he decreased the time from 26 minutes to 14 minutes. That is some of the work on vegetables.

The work of Hammerberg in Connecticut indicates that we can cut the time per cow by the use of better methods from 150 hours per cow to 100 hours per cow per year. Woodworth, of New Hampshire, recorded similar differences on New Hampshire dairy farms.

Mr. TABER. One hundred hours per year per cow?

Mr. BRAUM. Yes, sir; 100 hours per year per cow.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that in milking time?

Mr. BRAUM. That is in milking and in care for the cow.

Mr. TABER. That means you cut down the time about 15 minutes a day for each cow?

Mr. BRAUM. Approximately, 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. We will include your justification here on farm-work simplification in the record. It still leaves uncertainty as to just what the nature of this work is.

Mr. BRAUM. Yes, sir.

(The justification referred to is as follows:)

5. FARM WORK SIMPLIFICATION

The demand on our farmers for food, both for our allies and for domestic consumption, will be greater than ever before. New farm machinery has been rationed at only 20 percent of the normal supply. Many of the agricultural workers available next season will be inexperienced. The problem has become so serious that every labor resource we have must be developed to full capacity.

The spectacular economics in manpower and labor output secured in industry by the application of principles of work simplification and motion economy are widely recognized. In Europe farm experts have applied these principles to agriculture, with good results. A few experimental studies in this country have also indicated their value.

It is therefore proposed to establish a project in farm-work simplification. farm-work simplification demands, first, coordinated effort by time and motion engineers to synthesize the best possible methods of doing specific jobs, and second, widespread distribution of this information to the farmer in ways really helpful to him. Its success rests on the promise that all government and other interested agencies will enlist their resources in the project.

The advantage of a farm-work simplification program to United States agriculture would be:

I. *Meets farm-labor shortage.*—The shortage of farm labor in 1943 threatens needed food supplies so seriously that every labor resource avialable should be developed to full capacity. The proposed program for farm work simplification offers an organized integrated program to increase labor efficiency by applying to farm routines procedures already found effective in industry and in agrieulture abroad.

II. *Compensates for limitation on farm machinery.*—Faced with increased demand and decreased labor supply, farmers have usually expanded their production by additional use of machinery. Limitations on steel reduce replacement of machinery to 20 percent of normal. While the patriotic acceptance of the limitations by farmers can be anticipated as a matter of course, farmers nevertheless have a right to expect effective suggestions on substitute methods. Farm-work simplification supplies plans to make better use of present machinery, eliminate or combine operations to conserve labor, and reduce the time and fatigue where hand labor must replace machine operation.

III. *Trains inexperienced hands.*—Synthesized skills have proved simpler, easier to teach and to learn, than hit-and-miss methods in which individuals have become proficient. Much of the new labor available to farmers next season will be inexperienced. Even this year farmers have been using townspeople, high-school students, women, and others unaccustomed to farm work, to a limited extent. Mobile groups from Mexico and elsewhere are being transported into areas where crops are new to them. All these people need special skill training. farm work simplification provides this through "methods" engineering similar to that used on routine jobs in industry.

IV. *Sets standards for farm-labor output.*—Farmers have found it difficult to measure their own efficiency because no standards have been available for comparison. While variations in farm materials and equipment require a wider range of standards than is characteristic of most factory operations, limited experiments on farm jobs have already proved the value of skill and time measurement on characteristic routines. Demonstrating a worker's normal output on similar jobs frequently increases his speed. The first essential a farmer needs to plan jobs is to know what he can do in a given time.

V. *Increases production of critical items.*—The advantage of farm-work simplification in increasing production of critical items for the lend-lease and other war programs should be emphasized. For instance, the demand for milk, for casein as well as for dried milk and cheese for export, is absorbing a large proportion of our normal production, and is increasing rapidly. Many foods of high energy and vitamin content, such as vegetables and fruits, require much hand labor. Labor-saving techniques are essential to increasing the supply of these essentials.

VI. *Reduces accidents.*—Injuries and accidents on the farm can be decreased by the application of farm work simplification. Motion-economy technique reduces accident hazards by increase of skill and better care and location of ladders, tools, and other equipment. It reduces accidents due to awkwardness. It also aids in reducing fatigue, a high element in all accident rates.

VII. *Facilitates replacement of men by women.*—Women abroad, and increasingly in this country, are participating in field work and the operation of farm machinery as well as in the usual farm chores. Expert study of farm jobs will indicate where adaptations are necessary to make women effective in production, and establish the confidence of farmers in their employment as farm hands.

VIII. *Attracts better workers.*—The Department of Agriculture has long sought means to stimulate among farmers and the public generally appreciation of the technical and professional character of farm work. Farm-work simplification demonstrates the rewards possible by the application of training and intelligence to even routine farm jobs, thereby reducing their monotony and attracting to them better attention and a higher quality of worker.

IX. *Has permanent as well as emergency value.*—While the emergency values of farm-work simplification are those of immediate importance, its permanent values in increasing profits and reducing costs are so great that they will benefit farmers for years to come. Initial distribution of the suggestions to farmers would ordinarily be eostly. At the moment this is greatly simplified by the interest of the general public and of commercial food concerns in adequate food supply, assuring quick response and voluntary cooperation in the discussion of the program and constructive evaluation of results.

Recruiting, placing, and transporting of transient and supplementary farm labor forces themselves are not sufficient to assure the greatest efficiency from the labor of the workers served. It is important—and for the first time, perhaps,

essential—to undertake a deliberate program for increasing the work efficiency of all farm labor by means of specific training to improve their skills. Preliminary investigations have provided a firm basis for the belief that even "experienced" farm workers can learn to pick faster, to block and thin more rapidly, to perform all of their tasks with greater efficiency after relatively brief training courses imparting principles of work simplification and conservation of motion.

If training along the lines of motion study and scientific management can improve the output of experienced farm workers, as has been demonstrated, it is even more necessary in the case of supplementary workers who are frequently totally inexperienced and only have the faintest idea of the procedure to use in fruit picking, or bean picking, or whatever they may be called upon to do.

Private industry has for many years made profitable use of work simplification. This was possible because industry has many jobs concentrated in one place and the operation is sufficiently large to justify the expense of research and training. On farms it is different. The majority of farm units are too small to enable the operator to employ experts to aid him with such work. It would appear, therefore, that the Department of Agriculture could well provide these technical services as a means of promoting fullest use of the available farm labor.

This program can be accomplished by (1) survey and careful review of applicable work that has been done in the field of work simplification and motion economy both in industry and in agriculture; (2) conducting a motion analysis of selected farm jobs that involve millions of hands for a large number of days a year; (3) a unified study of the general application of work simplification principles to daily routine farm jobs of short duration; (4) the preparation of training materials to be furnished to farmers; and (5) providing brief training courses imparting principles of work simplification.

FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS

The funds requested under this project are to provide for only the over-all development of basic material, techniques and methods to be used in the training of farmers and farm workers. The facilities and the personnel necessary to distribute the material and train farmers and farm workers will be provided by other agencies, including the Extension Service and the Office of Education.

The CHAIRMAN. I will ask you how you propose to do it. I see you intend to employ 16 persons here.

Mr. BRAUM. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. All of these are here in the Department?

Mr. BRAUM. They are all in Washington headquarters.

The CHAIRMAN. Just what will those 16 persons do?

Mr. BRAUM. They will work with the Bureaus in the Department of Agriculture which have already shown considerable interest in seeing farm work simplified as part of their program, and they will work with the land-grant colleges to make their information available to the Bureaus in the Departments. They will cooperate with the large commercial interests who expect to use more simplified methods, particularly the large concerns packaging and packing, and the milk-products people, milk condensers, and that whole group of people. They will work primarily to keep bringing the idea before the people. They will take those methods and materials most successful in simplifying work in industry and make farm applications.

ADMINISTRATION OF ENTIRE FARM LABOR PROGRAM

[See p. 85]

The CHAIRMAN. In your over-all administration you want 661 people, 71 in the Department in Washington, and 585 in the field, at a total cost of $1,038,229 for personal services. You have a breakdown here of salaries in Washington and salaries in the field, and for travel, transportation of things, communication services, rents, and utility service, and so forth, totaling in all $1,297,430. Does this apply to your entire program?

Major WALKER. That is general administration of the entire program and a limited number of field people or particular labor men in each State who will report directly to this office, and certain people that we have to have to work in connection with the Manpower Commission at their regional area levels. A large part of it is in connection with the accounting and other service functions.

(The break-down on project No. 6, administration, is as follows:)

Farm labor program, Department of Agriculture—Project No. 6, administration

By objects	Obligations			
	6 months' estimate, 1944		4 months' estimate, 1943	
	Man-years	Average salary	Man-years	Average salary
PERSONAL SERVICES, DEPARTMENTAL				
Professional service:				
Grade 8. Range $8,000 to $9,000: Director, Farm Labor Division	1	$8,500	1	$8,500
Grade 7. Range $6,500 to $7,500: Assistant Director, Farm Labor Division	1	6,500	1	6,500
Grade 6. Range $5,600 to $6,400:				
Labor consultant	1	5,600	1	5,600
Labor coordinator	1	5,600	1	5,600
Labor analyst	1	5,600	1	5,600
Grade 5. Range $4,600 to $5,400:				
Associate labor consultant	1	4,600	1	4,600
Associate labor coordinator	1	4,600	1	4,600
Associate labor analyst	1	4,600	1	4,600
Grade 4. Range $3,800 to $4,600: Labor analyst	3	3,800	3	3,800
Clerical, administrative, and fiscal service:				
Grade 13. Range $5,600 to $6,400: Labor representative	1	5,600	1	5,600
Grade 12. Range $4,600 to $5,400:				
Senior medical officer	1	4,600	1	4,600
Associate labor representative	1	4,600	1	4,600
Grade 11. Range $3,800 to $4,600: Labor supervisor	2	3,800	2	3,800
Grade 9. Range $3,200 to $3,800:				
Personnel placement officer	2	3,200	2	3,200
Field labor analyst	6	3,200	6	3,200
Grade 7. Range $2,600 to $3,200:				
Administrative assistant	1	2,600	1	2,600
Senior cost analyst	8	2,600	8	2,600
Grade 6. Range $2,300 to $2,900	5	2,300	5	2,300
Grade 5. Range $2,000 to $2,600	8	2,000	8	2,000
Grade 4. Range $1,800 to $2,160	9	1,800	9	1,800
Grade 3. Range $1,620 to $1,980	15	1,620	15	1,620
Grade 2. Range $1,440 to $1,800	6	1,440	6	1,440
Total permanent, departmental	76	205,040	76	205,040
Deduct delay in filling new positions and lapses		85,431		145,033
All personal services, departmental		119,609		60,007
PERSONAL SERVICES, FIELD				
Clerical, administrative, and fiscal service:				
Grade 12. Range $4,600 to $5,400: Senior medical officer	1	4,600	1	4,600
Grade 11. Range $3,800 to $4,600: Dental officer	4	3,800	4	3,800
Grade 9. Range $3,200 to $3,800:				
Associate health specialist	12	3,200	12	3,200
Associate program analyst	12	3,200	12	3,200
Associate information specialist	12	3,200	12	3,200
Senior administrative assistant	2	3,200	2	3,200
Grade 8. Range $2,900 to $3,500:				
Supervising accountant	12	2,900	12	2,900
Assistant investigator	12	2,900	12	2,900
Grade 7. Range $2,600 to $3,200:				
Personnel investigator	12	2,600	12	2,600
Labor representative	48	2,600	48	2,600
Grade 6. Range $2,300 to $2,900	36	2,300	36	2,300
Grade 5. Range $2,000 to $2,600	40	2,000	40	2,000
Grade 4. Range $1,800 to $2,160	136	1,800	136	1,800

Farm labor program, Department of Agriculture—Project No. 6, administration —Continued

By objects	Obligations			
	6 months' estimate, 1944		4 months' estimate, 1943	
	Man-years	Average salary	Man-years	Average salary
PERSONAL SERVICES, FIELD—continued				
Clerical, administrative, and fiscal service—Continued.				
Grade 3. Range $1,620 to $1,980	120	$1,620	120	$1,620
Grade 2. Range $1,440 to $1,800	108	1,440	108	1,440
Grade 1. Range $1,260 to $1,620	18	1,260	18	1,260
Total permanent, field	585	1,147,200	585	1,147,200
Deduct delay in filling new positions and lapses		478,000		956,787
All personal services, field		669,200		190,413
01 Personal services (net)		788,809		250,420
OTHER OBLIGATIONS				
02 Travel		92,450		52,700
03 Transportation of things		1,500		1,000
04 Communication services		10,000		6,835
05 Rents and utility services		20,100		6,200
06 Printing and binding		13,010		9,580

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Walker, I note here that out of those 661 employees under general administration, as shown by the green sheets, that you have made provision for medical officers, dentists, labor coordinators, labor consultants, health specialists, program analysts, information specialists, and labor representatives. Tell us what would be the use of these men, and what functions they are charged with. We can understand medical officers and dentists. That means that you give free medical and dental service?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir; That is in connection with two things. One of them is to do the medical examination of people before we move them, in order to keep from moving the kind that you have mentioned heretofore, and the second purpose is in these labor centers to try to give a certain amount of medical supervision so as to keep them in good health on the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The dentists would be used there on the job?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What do labor coordinators do?

Major WALKER. The one in my office will have a staff of three divisions dealing with operations, carrying on the program, and in the general supervision of the movement of labor, and the selection of the places that they come from, to see that they are not taking too many people from one place or moving too many into another, and to follow through on the activities of the three general groups that we have to work through to keep them properly related to each other.

The CHAIRMAN. What about your labor consultants; what do they do?

Major WALKER. As to the labor consultants, these three men will be the heads of the three divisions, one dealing with labor relations outside, that is, usually with the Army and the War Manpower Commission, the conscientious objector groups, and the railroad people in the movement of troops, and all of the others outside. One

will be dealing with the selection, the area selected where they will move to, and the third one will be dealing with the Farm Security Administration and the Extension Service and the war boards in their related places in the whole picture.

The CHAIRMAN. And your labor analysts; what will they do?

Major WALKER. I do not know that I have labeled them right.

The CHAIRMAN. You have given us medical officers, dentists, labor coordinators, labor consultants, labor analysts, health specialists, program analysts, information specialists, and labor representatives. Tell us what the functions of each of them are.

Major WALKER. We will have one of these health specialists, one program analyst, and one information specialist in each region. There are 12 regions that we are operating through at the present time, largely because of the Farm Security set-up, and the 12 regional offices there. I propose to have, if this is approved, one labor representative in each State who will be directly responsible to this office for the proper handling of the labor program within that State.

Mr. WOODRUM. Why do you need a labor representative in this thing. There is no question of organized labor or labor unions mixed up in this, is there?

Major WALKER. No, sir; it is not a labor man in that sense.

Mr. WOODRUM. You have used an unfortunate term there.

Major WALKER. The term may be bad, but it is not intended in that sense. The intention is that he is a man who is concerned with the labor program we are proposing in this organization. He is not necessarily a labor representative from the standpoint of organized labor, or anything of that kind. As a matter of fact, I was not thinking of a person of that type at all in this job, because I do not think it is the kind of thing that he would be particularly fitted for or useful in.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Cannon asked you to explain each one of those categories that he had on his pad there.

Major WALKER. Well, in each of these regions an associated health specialist will have charge of whatever health program in connection with these labor centers the particular region calls for.

The program analyst will follow through and keep track of where the labor is wanted, when it is wanted, and where it is coming from in that region.

An information specialist is an information man that is supposed to keep the public informed as to what they are doing and what is happening or going on in the program in this region.

Mr. WOODRUM. How much of the $65,000,000 will be allotted to other agencies, how much to the Farm Security Administration, and how much to the Extension Service, and so forth?

Major WALKER. We do not have that Mr. Woodrum, but I shall be glad to put a statement in the record on that.

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; suppose you fix up a statement for us and you can put it in the record.

Mr. WILSON. The amount for the Extension Service is $6,158,000, but it may be more.

Mr. WOODRUM. It probably might be more than that?

Mr. WILSON. It might be, but that is their project.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

Farm labor program, Department of Agriculture

By projects or functions	Obligations	
	6 months [1] estimate, 1944	4 months [1] estimate, 1943
1. Farm labor transportation (by Farm Security Administration)	$26,881,326	$13,039,538
2. Farm labor centers (by Farm Security Administration):		
(a) Operations, maintenance, and management	3,380,451	1,341,621
(b) Development and construction	2,100,000	10,650,000
Total project 2	5,480,451	11,991,621
3. Mobilization of local labor resources, nonfarm youth and nonfarm women for farm labor (by Extension Service):		
(a) Recruitment and placement of local labor	2,216,750	1,515,750
(b) Victory farm volunteers	725,000	900,000
(c) Women's land army	100,000	50,000
(d) Federal and State administration and supervision	393,051	258,754
Total project 3	3,434,801	2,724,504
4. Investigation of farm wage rates (by Bureau of Agricultural Economics	61,895	35,000
5. Farm work simplification (by Office of Personnel)	63,091	65,343
6. Administration (by Food Production Administration and Farm Security Administration)	951,595	345,835
Grand total obligations	36,873,159	28,201,841
1943 unobligated balance available in 1944	−36,873,159	+36,873,159
Total estimate or appropriation		65,075,000

LANGUAGE OF BUDGET ESTIMATE

Mr. WOODRUM. Looking at the language in the estimate, Major Walker, it states:

For expenses necessary for the formulation, development, and execution, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and either independently or in cooperation with individuals or agencies, public or private, of a plan to assist in providing an adequate supply and distribution of labor.

Say something about what is contemplated under that language, and how you expect to operate.

Major WALKER. We are expecting to operate through three agencies in the Department, the Farm Security, the Extension Service, and the war boards under the triple A. The war boards in each State and in the county will have general supervision and coordination of the program. The other agencies of the Government that we will be working particularly close with will be the Office of Education in the training program, and the United States Employment Service in the facilities that they have and that can be used in carrying on this program. The private agencies that we thought of were largely the farm organizations and any other local organizations that would be helpful in the mobilization program.

Mr. WOODRUM. You use the words, "including aliens," several times in this appropriation language. What is contemplated in that respect?

Major WALKER. We provided for "including aliens" largely because of the importation of labor from Mexico, and possibly importations from the Bahamas. A question also arose when the Mexican Government indicated they would like to have their representatives

in this country to look after the welfare of their nationals. So that our Government can employ Mexicans or other appropriate aliens to negotiate and work with the Mexican workers, this language is necessary.

Mr. WOODRUM. I presume that is the reason for that language, "continental United States and elsewhere"?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM. It is to take in those two categories of people?

Major WALKER. Yes. The negotiatons with the Mexican laborers are currently required and negotiations with Bahaman's will be necessary if such labor is imported. Canadians were brought in last year and will probably be used again this year. Negotiations with the Canadians have been carried on by the Employment Service, and I have asked them to continue to deal with the laborers from Canada.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will you say something about No. 2 there, for the "furnishing, by loans, grants, or otherwise, of medical services, training, subsistence, and shelter"?

Major WALKER. We are, of course, providing subsistence under certain conditions, and subsistence payments en route in the form of grants. So far, we have not made any advances in the form of a loan. I do not know whether the authorization for "loans" will be necessary.

Mr. WOODRUM. It does not say that it just applies en route.

Major WALKER. No, sir; we do not intend for it to apply only en route. Subsistence will need to be provided on many different occasions. For example, the Mexican agreement provided that we would guarantee 75 percent employment and for less than 75 percent we would give them subsistence grants equivalent to $3 per day. So far we have been able to keep them so fully employed that the question of grants in those cases has not arisen. We will need authorization to permit carrying out this agreement.

Mr. WOODRUM. What about No. 3, "construction or lease and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services"?

Major WALKER. That is to provide for the construction or lease of additional farm labor supply centers. This estimate contemplates that an additional 250 centers will be required. It is planned that where it is possible we will lease existing facilities, for example, a tourist camp which is now closed. Thus, it may be possible to provide this essential expansion of farm labor centers without the complete installation of water, electricity and other utilities which are hard to obtain at the present time. It also, is to provide for the operation and maintenance of the existing as well as the additional farm labor centers.

Mr. WOODRUM. How about automobiles; how many are you going to have? It states here:

purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles.

Major WALKER. Mainly, the automobiles that I visualize we will need are some trucks in connection with moving camps.

Mr. WOODRUM. This says passenger-carrying vehicles.

Major WALKER. I do not visualize the purchase of any passenger cars.

Mr. WOODRUM. You do not need them?

Major WALKER. No.

(The Department subsequently furnished the following statement:)

Major Walker's above answers were intended to apply only to the purchase and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles in the District of Columbia. Passenger-carrying vehicles will not be required in the District of Columbia, but additional cars will be required in the field service for the following reasons:

1. Due to the mobile character of the labor supply centers, and their location, in many cases being in rural areas or other areas not accessible by public transportation, cars will be required to transport the personnel of farm labor supply centers.

2. Cars will also be required in the recruiting of workers, since recruitment in many cases will be carried on in areas which are not accessible by public transportation.

3. Cars will be required in the supervision and placing of farm labor, since much of this activity will be performed in areas not accessible by public transportation.

Mr. WOODRUM. This also states, "acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services."

Major WALKER. Department of Agriculture, particularly the Extension Service, use a very large number of voluntary workers, especially at the county levels. This labor mobilization program is going to require the assistance of as many volunteer people as are willing to make their services available.

Mr. WOODRUM. Such as people connected with State governments?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir; people connected with State governments, county, and other political subdivisions as well as perhaps some private agencies.

Mr. WOODRUM. People of that type?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM. This also provides—

travel expenses of persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating capacities from a foreign country to the United States and return.

What is contemplated in that?

Major WALKER. The representatives of the Mexican Government who are assigned to look after the laborers for Mexico are allowed a very small per diem allowance compared to ours. I think they are allowed about 5 pesos a day, which is about equivalent to $1 in this country. They are having considerable difficulty defraying their actual expenses and this authorization would permit their travel expenses being provided under this item.

Mr. WOODRUM. Then, what about this part of it that waives the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes entirely?

Major WALKER. Is that the one dealing with competitive bidding?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Major WALKER. Because of the emergency nature of this program and the prompt action which is needed in order to provide the necessary facilities, it is believed imperative that provisions for the waiving of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes be included in this appropriation. Many of the materials and supplies required in the construction of labor supply centers will be difficult to obtain and when such items do become available for purchase we must be authorized to enter into immediate arrangements so that they won't be sold by the time competitive bidding could be completed. From past experience we know that the speed with which this urgently needed program can be put into action depends seriously on section 3709 being waived.

Mr. WOODRUM. Now, you have a provision here providing for reimbursement for work performed for any other agency. Explain that, please.

Major WALKER. Many people have advocated the need for the Department to organize a farm labor force or army, so-called, to be used as a mobile labor force. Under this plan the Government would enter into a contract with some growers for the harvesting of a particular crop, the labor to be furnished by the Government. Since the Government would be paying the wages of the farm laborers from this appropriation the contract sum paid by the grower would be handled as reimbursement to this fund.

Mr. WOODRUM. Next to the last proviso is—

That transfers may be made, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, from this appropriation to any bureau or office of the Department of Agriculture, or to any other agency of the Government, which is assigned functions in connection herewith.

Say something about that.

Major WALKER. I would like to have Mr. Maycock explain that, sir.

Mr. MAYCOCK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this proposed language is to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to take the best advantage of whatever facilities might exist, not only in the Department of Agriculture but in other agencies of the Government, in order that he might not have to set up any duplicating machinery to carry out this program.

Mr. WOODRUM. In other words, it only provides that you can transfer these funds where you are assigning some functions under this act to the other agency, and that you can reimburse it?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM. If you assign functions under this act to any other Government agency, you may pay them for that service?

Mr. MAYCOCK. That is true, and you will notice that it is with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. WOODRUM. The last one is the withholding tax.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir; the withholding tax. It can be troublesome on the Mexican or other alien labor. Under the Internal Revenue Code, a fixed percentage, I believe 30 percent, of the earnings of alien labor must be withheld to be applied against any income tax which may be due. Since the earnings of these laborers will be comparatively small as they won't be employed any full year, it will result in considerable extra work for the employer as well as the Government if this provision is not waived.

Mr. LUDLOW. I have a number of questions which, perhaps, more properly might have been addressed to Secretary Wickard or Governor Townsend, but I do not see that they are now here, and I would like to address them to Major Walker, if I may.

Mr. WOODRUM. All right, sir.

DIFFICULTY OF GETTING LABOR TO MIGRATE

Mr. LUDLOW. We have heard a great deal of discussion about moving people by the thousands from one location to another. That, I understood, would be an entirely voluntary operation, would it not?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LUDLOW. There would be no sanctions directly or indirectly to move them?

Major WALKER. No, sir; it is entirely within each individual's determination.

Mr. LUDLOW. In this matter you are dealing with the tenderest emotions of the human heart, "Be it ever so humble, there is no place like home." The mountaineer has a little wheat patch and a tumble-down log cabin as his home, but to him it is the dearest place on earth. While I comprehend the importance of your task, I can see immeasurable difficulties in getting these people to move. I think you will find that not 1 in 10 will be willing to move. What has been your experience in that respect?

Major WALKER. We have just started it, but so far about 650 have moved and have made arrangements with farmers in new areas. There are about 850 now that are at either one of the colleges or some vocational agricultural school, or at a particular type of farm work, spending a week or 10 days or 3 weeks there before making the pull-over, that is, a deal with a farmer in a new place. So far that is the only indication we have had.

Mr. LUDLOW. Are not the home owners, especially those who live in these cabins in the mountains, very reluctant to give up those homes, even under the most attractive inducement?

Major WALKER. Where they own them they may continue the ownership of them. It does not separate them from that ownership. There are a certain number of them that are interested in a thing of this kind.

ALTERNATE SOLUTIONS OF FARM LABOR PROBLEM

Mr. LUDLOW. I am wondering if there cannot be a little better approach to this momentous problem that we have before us: Suppose the Commander in Chief would order a reexamination of the Army and Navy rolls and say restore to farm occupations all of those who are best suited to them, and then further suppose that instructions or directives should go out to the selective service boards saying that hereafter they were not to induct men who were primarily valuable in agriculture? Would not that be a little more practical approach to it than this immensely complicated set-up that you have presented here?

Major WALKER. Of course, as Governor Townsend said this morning, that is something that would be very helpful in this program and would ease it up tremendously. He is really confronted with trying to do something else about it.

Mr. LUDLOW. I am just trying to figure on what might be done, rather than on what will be done. I do not know that it will be done, but it seems to me you would have a very practical approach to it there, whereas, with all due respect to the presentation here, there seem to me to be so many complicated features, and so many new innovations that are brought into the picture that it is going to be an immensely difficult undertaking.

Major WALKER. It is; yes, sir.

IMPORTATION OF CHINESE LABOR

Mr. LUDLOW. Then, I have another question, and, perhaps, I am asking this under the spell of this magnificent woman who has just addressed us in the House here today. China is the most overpopulated country in the world. Would it be of any practical value at all to try to make an arrangement to bring into this country high-quality Chinese to work in such activities as you propose to use the Mexicans in, or would the distance of transportation or the practical obstacles be too great?

Major WALKER. The distance and the transportation arrangements are pretty difficult now. We have had that same matter up in connection with the Puerto Ricans where we have a tremendous population, and the difficulty of arranging for convoys and ships to bring them in presents an almost impossible situation to meet at the present time.

The Mexicans are the easiest and the quickest to bring in, and the areas to which they are going in California, Arizona, and Texas have used them for a good many years in the particular types of work.

HOURS OF WORK

Mr. LUDLOW. I note in the proposed contract here with those that are to be transported that you fix a minimum pay of $3 a day, and the working hour range, as I understand it, is from 8 to 12 hours a day. What is it, is it nearer to 8 hours than 12?

Major WALKER. It has been nearer to 12, I think. They tried to make that range in there, because of the fact, as far as we could discover, 12 hours was the maximum that under any circumstances they should work these people, and we wanted to have enough range in there so that if it was necessary for a man to be worked longer than 8 hours he would not be bringing out the contract and saying it could not be done.

Mr. LUDLOW. I was one of those brought up on a farm, and I have followed the plow all day many a day. We used to get up and start to work long before daybreak, and we were still working until it became too dark to work, and I do not see how you could fix an 8-hour day or anything like it on a farm.

Major WALKER. I think you are right, and on this high-peak seasonal type of employment they have operated on that basis in the past.

AGGREGATE SHORTAGE IN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. LUDLOW. What is your estimate of the total number of persons that would have to be brought into agricultural pursuits in order to have a sound agricultural economy? About how many do you think we are short?

Major WALKER. You are asking me a question that I do not know very much about.

Mr. LUDLOW. Governor McNutt, sitting on the other side of the table the other day, where you are now sitting, estimated that we are 1,000,000 short. I take it, the situation has become much more aggravated since then, and we are probably 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 short now.

Major WALKER. According to my recollection, and I do not guarantee the figures, because they are out of my province, they estimated that there were about 8,200,000 workers on the farms about the 1st of January.

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Major WALKER. Usually that has been up as high as 9,000,000, and then at peak seasons, that is, during harvest periods and heavy employment periods, it has risen normally to about 12,000,000 at peak times.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is the reservoir of employment. Now, how much shortage would you say there is at the present time?

Major WALKER. It is also estimated that the Army and the war industries have taken in the last 2 years about 3,000,000 people from rural areas. Now, the rural areas include little towns, as well as actual farms.

Of that number it is figured that about 40 percent of them have gone into the Army, and about 60 percent of them have gone into industry. Industry is the hardest thing to control because you have a high price structure that is attractive and it pulls people out very easily.

Mr. LUDLOW. I would like to say for the record, Mr. Chairman, that I believe if this problem is capable of solution, if anybody can solve it, that Governor Townsend and his associates can. Governor Townsend gave a wonderfully able administration to the office of Governor of Indiana, and he himself is a practical farmer. There is no one in the country who is better acquainted with the problems of the farm than Governor Townsend.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to make this observation right there. You said about 60 percent are going into industry, and about 40 percent into the Army, that is, of the number of men who are leaving the farms; is that right?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir; that is the best figure we have been able to get.

Mr. SNYDER. I think you will find that it is nearer to 65 percent and 35 percent. Be that as it may, how many do you think are in the factories that came from the farm, boys that were raised on the farm and who had lived there all their lives, and then who heard of big wages being paid down in the Martin plant in Baltimore, left the farm and left their dad there alone, or maybe two boys in one family left the farm and left their dad there alone, left the farm to make $8, $10, or $12 a day? How many of that type do you think there are in industry?

Major WALKER. I would not even guess.

Mr. SNYDER. We can fill all of those places in industry with women with very few exceptions.

Why do not the draft boards, for instance, pick out all of these fellows who left the farm and went into industries at big salaries, and say to them, "Here, we will give you $50 a month to come back to the farm. If you do not choose to do that, you are in the Army"?

One of those fellows who was brought up on a farm is worth three of this type that you are talking about taking out of the city and hauling them around over the country. I am not going to condemn it, because I do not have anything better to suggest than that which I have just suggested here.

Major WALKER. I do not know what to suggest on that.

There was one observation I heard yesterday about men in the Army that was rather interesting. It was that about 50 percent of the people who were called up for examination from the farms have been turned down for physical reasons.

Mr. SNYDER. Fifty per cent—42 percent is the highest so far, but go ahead.

Major WALKER. They have been turned down for physical reasons, many of which would have no bearing on employment otherwise. Well, now, after they have been turned down and put in 4–F, I think it is, it gives them a preferred place under the draft whereby they can go anywhere they please, and they are completely protected from any disturbance. Now, someone suggested that it might be well to reclassify all of those men, and, perhaps, put them in a class that should be either 2c or the 3c classification, which gives them an exemption as long as they are on the farm, but does not apply if they stay in industry.

Mr. SNYDER. I think that is a good suggestion.

Major WALKER. That is something that has been brought to the attention of the Selective Service people.

Mr. SNYDER. What are you going to do this year throughout the Nation with reference to allowing increased acreage? Maybe it has been said and I did not hear it. If it has, do not repeat it. We had so many acres of corn and staple crops last year in this State or in this county or on this farm. What are we going to do about letting them increase that acreage? Is there a fixed percentage of increase, or what is it?

Major WALKER. I am not in a position to answer that.

Mr. SNYDER. Who can answer it?

Mr. WEBSTER. The only crops on which there are at present any limits are cotton and wheat, on which the quotas have been set, both of which we have very large supplies.

Mr. SNYDER. Do you mean to say that they are going to restrict the number of acres of wheat that can be sown this year?

Mr. WEBSTER. We have an acreage allotment of 55,000,000 acres of wheat, and the acreage allotment of cotton is around, 27,000,000 acres.

COTTON AND WHEAT IN STORAGE

Mr. SNYDER. How much wheat do we have now in storage in this country?

Mr. WEBSTER. I do not have that exact figure.

Mr. SNYDER. At the rate of consumption of last year, how long will it last?

Mr. WEBSTER. Probably a year and a half or 2 years' supply.

Mr. TABER. If you do not know, put it in the record exactly, instead of guessing, because we do not want any guesswork.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; put it in the record.

Mr. WEBSTER. Yes, sir; I shall be glad to.

Mr. TABER. Where is that stuff; is it in Government warehouses, or private warehouses or elevators? Tell us where it is in the statement we have requested for the record.

Mr. WEBSTER. Yes, sir. (See statement on p. 84.)

Mr. SNYDER. How much cotton do we have on hand?

Mr. WEBSTER. Something less than a 2 years' supply.

Mr. TABER. Let us have the answer on that in the same way, telling us how much.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; how many bales we have.

Mr. WEBSTER. I will insert that in the record.

Mr. TABER. And give us the same information on that, as to where it is, as to whether it is in Government warehouses or private warehouses.

Mr. WEBSTER. Yes, sir.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

1. The 1942 wheat and cotton crop acreage allotments were as follows:

	Acres
Wheat	55, 000, 000
Cotton	27, 485, 000

2. As of Jan. 1, 1943, supplies of wheat were stored as follows:

	Bushels
Stored in interior mills and warehouses	235, 000, 000
Stored in terminal markets in approximately 46 cities	245, 000, 000
Stored in merchants' mills	139, 000, 000
Stored on farms	495, 000, 000
Stored in Commodity Credit Corporation bins and owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation as of Jan. 30, 1943	41, 000, 000
Total	[1] 1, 155, 000, 000

[1] Includes, exclusive of the 41,000,000 bushels stored in Commodity Credit Corporation bins, approximately 699,000,000 bushels under loan or owned by Commodity Credit Corporation. Of this 699,000,000 bushels it is estimated that approximately 400,000,000 bushels is stored in warehouses conforming with Government regulations and the remaining 299,000,000 bushels is stored on farms.

3. It is estimated that present supplies of wheat will last approximately 2 years.
4. As of Jan. 31, 1943, supplies of cotton were stored as follows:

	Bales
Stored in privately owned warehouses	13, 069, 379
Stored in mills and warehouses	2, 500, 000
In transit, being ginned, or in gin yards	[1] 1, 000, 000
Total	[2] 16, 569, 379

[1] Approximate.
[2] Includes 5,500,000 bales under loan or owned by Commodity Credit Corporation, of which it is estimated approximately 8,000 bales is stored on farms and remaining 7,700,000 bales is stored in warehouses conforming with Government regulations.

5. It is estimated that present supplies of cotton will last approximately 17 months.

TRANSPORTATION OF FARM LABOR GREAT DISTANCES

Mr. SNYDER. In getting these farm laborers, I notice here that you hauled some out of Missouri into California under this program, and then in another place you took them into Missouri. I just wanted to clear that up a little bit. Mr. Cannon was saying here yesterday that he could not get farm help for his farm.

Major WALKER. We moved some of them into California and some into Arizona. Some of those are just at present on their way back. They have finished their job, and some of them have already returned home. We did not move any into Missouri from outside the State.

Mr. SNYDER. You moved none into Missouri?

Major WALKER. No, sir.

Mr. SNYDER. You moved them from Missouri into Arizona and California?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir; for picking long-staple cotton.

EMPLOYEES OF FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TABER. Please put in the record the name of every former or present employee of the Farm Security Administration who is now engaged in this activity, or who it is contemplated will be engaged in this activity, with the background of each one.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

(NOTE.—Since this information must necessarily be obtained from field offices, it cannot be compiled in sufficient time for insertion in this record. This information will be furnished to the committee, however, as soon as available.)

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF ENTIRE PROGRAM

(See p. 72)

Mr. TABER. Also give us an explanation of why you need such an enormous sum for administrative expenses and so much departmental personnel. There has been no adequate statement on that, to my mind.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

The problem of farm labor supply is one which experience and study has proven cannot be entirely answered on a local or State basis. The areas of supply in many cases are distant from the areas of demand. In order to effectively coordinate the supply and demand in a prompt and efficient manner a sufficient organization must be established on a departmental level to coordinate and supervise the work of the field organization which is actively engaged in locating the supply and recruiting the prospective workers and determining the size, time, nature, and location of the demand.

The demand on transportation facilities makes it necessary that all arrangements for mass movements be cleared through the American Association of Railroads at the departmental level. For example, referring to the moves which have been accomplished to date it would be observed that workers were recruited in Tennessee and transported to Arizona, Florida, New Mexico, and Texas. Workers were recruited in Kentucky and transported to New York, Michigan, New Jersey, and Connecticut. Without an efficient national organization this would not have been possible.

Furthermore, the furnishing of farm laborers is not only national, but international, in character in that a number of workers are being supplied from Mexico. Arrangements with the Mexican Government must, of necessity, be accomplished at the departmental level, although the actual recruitment thereafter is accomplished with the field organizations.

The general planning for all aspects of the program must be performed at the departmental level to assure a successful program and to assure that the program keeps pace with the rapidly changing manpower problems.

As to the cost of administration, the following table reflects that 98 percent of the total farm-labor estimate will be required for direct program items. In other words, only 2 percent of the estimate will be required for administration.

How funds are to be used

Description:	*Total percent*
Direct program items	98.0
Farm-labor transportation	61.3
Farm-labor centers	26.8
Mobilization of local labor resources, nonfarm youth and nonfarm women for farm labor	9.5
Investigation of farm-wage rates	.2
Farm-work simplification	.2
Administration	2.0

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. As I understand it you are asking for $65,000,000 roughly, and it is contemplated that there will be 95 camps, is that right?

Major WALKER. No, sir. There are 250 new camps, and there are 95 old camps that are already in existence.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You are asking for a total of 3,447 personnel, if my arithmetic is right.

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How many laborers do you contemplate supplying with the funds you are requesting now, if you can say that figure?

Major WALKER. We contemplate moving approximately 350,000 seasonal workers.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. One way?

Major WALKER. No, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Both ways?

Major WALKER. That will be both ways; yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What authority have you got to induce or to make the individual laborer move?

Major WALKER. We have no authority to make them move. We have to recruit them.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You are just going to urge them and paint a picture that will attract them?

Major WALKER. We will give them whatever the picture is, and if they want to go they can.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not clear what financing you are asking here under your project 1, for $25,000,000 plus grants, subsidies, and contributions. Is this a 100-percent federally financed program, or are the States and localities going to contribute to it, and, if so, to what extent?

Major WALKER. No, sir, this is a 100-percent federally financed program. At the present time the growers pay $5 per head for each worker supplied them.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Per head?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir, per worker.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is all they pay?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir, and then we propose to charge rent to the workers in the camps.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Do you know what the total personnel on the Farm Security roll now is?

Major WALKER. No, sir, I do not.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will you put that figure in the record when you revise your remarks, please?

Major WALKER. Yes, sir.

The number of personnel on the Farm Security Administration pay roll as of October 31, 1942, was 14,938. It is estimated that the present personnel is 15,050, which includes Farm Security Administration employees paid from funds received from the Emergency fund of the President for the farm labor transportation program.

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1943.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF NATIONAL FARM ORGANIZATIONS

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. We will resume consideration of the supplemental estimate in House Document No. 106 for the farm labor program. We have invited to sit with us Mr. Fulmer, Mr. Pace, Mr. Andresen, and Mr. Hope, of the House Committee on Agriculture, and Mr. Tarver and Mr. Dirksen from the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

We have before us this afternoon representatives of the farm organizations. I understand that Mr. Goss of the National Grange has a statement to make to us, and I will ask Mr. Goss to present that statement, if he will.

STATEMENTS OF ALBERT S. GOSS, MASTER OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE, AND EZRA T. BENSON, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, when you handed this problem to the farm organizations for recommendation, you handed us a pretty tough job, as you know. We have not had time to form complete agreements as to all details. We are agreed that the present system is not working right, by any means; but we have some general recommendations here which we would like to make, and then discuss possibly some other recommendations which we can discuss off the record or on the record, as to details.

The CHAIRMAN. What organizations are represented?

Mr. GOSS. When I say "we" I refer to the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Grange.

We have been holding a number of conferences on the matter, and it is a bigger question than we were able to reach complete conclusion on in the limited time available.

JOINT STATEMENT OF PARTICIPATING FARM ORGANIZATIONS

We have a statement here which we are all agreed on, but which does not carry us over some of the details that you gentlemen will probably want to know about. I am going to ask Mr. Benson if he will read that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall be glad to hear from Mr. Benson. Mr. Benson represents the Farmer Cooperatives?

Mr. BENSON. The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

This is a joint statement:

On November 4, 1942, officials of the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives issued a joint statement calling attention to the serious manpower crisis and warned of a food shortage unless price-control policies and farm-labor policies were immediately changed. Specific recommendations were made to cope effectively with these problems but these recommendations went unheeded. We believe this statement is even more applicable today than it was then, and we reaffirm these recommendations.

The statement then issued was as follows:

The failure to plan for a workable, well-balanced manpower program at the outset of our war activities has led to an inevitable crisis which demands immediate and drastic adjustment. Wage levels in every war industry, including agriculture, must be brought into a free competitive balance, then stabilized to prevent further skyrocketing. Any attempts to freeze labor on the farm at lower than free competitive levels will not succeed.

Propaganda to the effect that the farmer will not voluntarily pay higher wages for farm labor, but is enriching himself at the expense of the consumer, is false. It is imperative that farmers receive prices enabling them to pay sufficient wages to induce farm operators and workers to remain on the farms.

We are greatly concerned over what we consider the misdirected efforts of agencies of Government to fasten upon farmers and farm workers far-reaching bureaucratic controls and restrictions. Under the guise of the war effort, a social revolution is being perpetrated upon the American people. We are convinced that unless these policies are immediately abandoned, we face within the foreseeable future a disastrous shortage of food for our armed forces, our civilian population, and our allies. Already serious loss of food and fiber has resulted from the present administration of farm labor and price-control policies.

It is an indisputable fact that the terrific drain of manpower from the farms—well over 1,500,000 in the past 12 months—is due to the refusal of this administration to deal effectively with industrial wages which have spiraled to unprecedented levels. Surveys show that twice as many farm workers have been lured into industry by fabulous wages as have joined the armed forces under selective service.

Farm prices are not responsible for inflation. Soaring industrial labor costs, beyond the control of farmers, constitute the major inflationary factor.

Attempts to superimpose impossible so-called social reforms on farmers and farm workers have seriously interfered with all efforts to meet the increasingly desperate farm labor shortage. Plans to bring needed workers from Mexico were loaded down with so many impractical requirements that so far farmers have obtained but little real help from this source. As an example, long-staple cotton, needed for the manufacture of parachutes, is in some cases actually being plowed under in the Southwest for lack of labor. Similar unworkable bureaucratic procedures and controls have been extended to the placement of seasonal domestic agricultural workers. We would vigorously oppose any attempts to inject such controls into draft deferments of agricultural workers.

We believe that skilled workers on the farm should be given deferred classification on the same basis as skilled workers in other war industries. We believe that the Tydings amendment to pending draft legislation, providing for deferment of essential farm labor until satisfactory replacements can be found, will be of great assistance if it is not tampered with and is administered according to its intent.

We do not believe that the use of subsidies is a sound approach to the solution of the farm labor problem. Subsidies lead inevitably to inflation, political manipulation, regimentation, and an intolerably expanded bureaucracy. The extensive use of subsidies in lieu of a sound price structure will bring the economic, social, and political bankruptcy of our country.

Organized agriculture has no representative on the War Manpower Commission, notwithstanding the fact that the Commission is continually dealing with problems that have a vital bearing on this essential war industry.

As representatives of the rank and file of American farmers, we are prepared to aid in every legitimate effort to solve this farm manpower crisis. We must have a practical approach to the whole farm production problem so that agriculture can make its maximum contribution to victory.

We recommend:

(1) That agriculture be recognized as an essential war industry by all branches of Government, and treated as such;

(2) That the Selective Service instruct its local boards to defer all essential farm workers and operators until satisfactory replacements can be found, as long as they remain in an essential agricultural occupation; and that suitable recognition for their contribution to the war effort be given to farmers and farm workers engaged in essential production, in line with that given to other war workers.

(3) That price ceilings on farm commodities be adjusted to carry out the intent and purpose of the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, providing adequate allowance for farmers' increased costs, including farm labor, thus enabling agriculture to keep a supply of labor to maintain adequate production;

(4) That all bureaucratic, unworkable regulations and controls, including fixing of minimum wages and regulating maximum hours and conditions of employment of agricultural workers, be eliminated, and that such restrictions on employment of farm labor as have been rejected by Congress be eliminated.

If the above recommendations are carried out, we believe we can meet the farm manpower problem adequately through democratic methods, without resort to bureaucratic regimentation and compulsion.

Today we are confronted with an acute food shortage—so much so that we are rationing a large number of food items and the canned food ration has been reduced 57 percent. The food shortage is not a theory; it is a reality.

It is our considered judgment that farmers will be unable to produce the food which is going to be required and that the food shortage next fall and winter may prove calamitous unless price-ceiling policies are immediately adjusted to enable farmers to secure and maintain sufficient manpower on the farms and offset their increased labor costs and unless adequate workable manpower policies are immediately put into operation which will assure an adequate supply of farm labor when it is needed without impractical, unnecessary regulations and restrictions which hamper rather than help farmers and farm workers produce to capacity.

We desire to emphasize the fact that the food shortage cannot be averted merely by putting on a campaign to recruit townspeople, high-school students, and urban women for seasonal farm work. It is essential to defer necessary workers who are now on the farms and to adjust price ceilings and price supports on agricultural commodities at levels which will enable farmers to pay sufficient wages to get back on the farms some of the labor which has gone to the cities because of higher wages.

It is also imperative to provide an adequate program to recruit and place essential workers and that this program be handled by a competent agency, in which farmers have confidence, without bureaucratic bungling and impractical, unnecessary restrictions.

In recent months, the farm labor shortage has become more acute in many areas and further losses of food and fiber have occurred because of the bungling of the farm labor program.

It is vitally important to place the entire program in competent hands—in an agency in which farmers have confidence and which can secure the maximum local cooperation of all available agencies and which can get under way quickly and effectively.

We are confronted with a real emergency. The planting season is only a few weeks distant for most areas of the Nation and is already at hand in some areas. We cannot afford to lose further time or risk further losses by divided authority, duplicating set-ups, and social experimentation.

We recommend that the administration of this program be decentralized as far as possible so as to enable each State and each county to develop programs best adapted to the needs of their areas.

With respect to workers imported from Mexico and other foreign nations, it is recommended that immediate setps be taken to secure the modification of the agreement with Mexico so as to remove existing impractical and unnecessary restrictions and requirements.

Finally, we insist—irrespective of what funds are appropriated—that all unworkable, hampering restrictions and controls, including the fixing of minimum wages, restrictions of hours, housing standards, unionization of workers be immediately discontinued. To that end we ask that Congress write into the proposed appropriation for farm labor recruitment a prohibition against the use of these funds, or any other funds made available for farm labor recruitment, to impose such restrictions with respect to agricultural labor which is exempted under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the National Labor Relations Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Goss, do you care to supplement that statement?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, the farm organizations are in complete agreement with the statement which has been read. We are not in position to make definite and detailed recommendations as to the amounts of money to be appropriated and how this money should be used. We are in substantial agreement on a part of it, but there are some features that we wish we might have more time to study.

May I talk off the record for a moment, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

(Discussion off the record.)

The CHAIRMAN. I might say, speaking for the committee, that it has just been suggested by Mr. Taber that it will be impossible for us to take this up on the floor this week, because the program is crowded, and there will be further time in which we would be glad to have any further suggestion which you might wish to make. In the meantime we will be pleased to have you make any statement you wish, or you may defer it to another time if you prefer.

Mr. GOSS. I have an idea, Mr. Chairman, that if we could have another day or two to discuss this thing, we will be able to present it to you in complete detail.

(Discussion off the record.)

PROPOSED AGREEMENTS BETWEEN FARMERS AND FARM LABORERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a few questions of Mr. Goss, the master of the Grange. Mr. Goss, I have before me a printed form, No. 502, the same being a proposed contract between the farmer and the laborer which seems to be printed by the Farm Security Administration of the Department of Agriculture. It appears to be an agreement under which the farmer would be required to pay the laborer a minimum of $3 a day regardless of the price of the farm commodity being planted or harvested, furnish housing facilities far beyond the possibilities of the average farm community and a lot of other impractical requirements for laborers who may be shuttled from one part of the country to another. Have you read that proposed contract?

Mr. GOSS. I have read a number of them. I do not know it by that number, but I have read a number of them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. According to paragraph (A), for instance, the farmer is not permitted under any circumstances to work a laborer on Sunday, although he might be operating a dairy, which makes Sunday work absolutely essential. Regardless of the fact that the laborer might be willing to work on Sunday, and there

is a shortage of butter and milk in almost every city and town in the country, we see this absurd and impractical provision.

Mr. Goss. There are very many impractical provisions that will not work at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with you that this and other provisions of the proposed contract which seems to be the brain-child of some impractical dreamer who never saw a farm, would be everything but satisfactory, and highly impractical. One thing is certain, whoever wrote that contract did not have in mind protecting the interests of either the farmer who owns the land and pays the high taxes and interest, nor the tenant farmer who toils from sun-up till dark, but only the transient worker who is proposed herewith to be transplanted from one section of the country to another. Not a single sentence in this long proposed contract protects the man who owns the farm, who has an investment, or the tenant farmer, who at best, can only hope to eke out a bare living for himself and his family.

Mr. Goss. And we are very decidedly of the opinion that all that has to be changed.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is one of the things on which you are in unanimous agreement?

Mr. Goss. Yes, sir. It is just some of the details as to what safeguards can be thrown around them, on which we need a little more time. I do not think we are in disagreement. We just need enough time to work that out.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, suppose we give these gentlemen until Thursday. Will that be sufficient time, Mr. Goss?

Mr. Goss. I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. How about Wednesday? Will it be convenient for you to return Wednesday morning at 10 o'clock?

Mr. Goss. I will have to ask the other gentlemen on that.

(Discussion off the record.)

INCREASE IN WEEKLY HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT IN INDUSTRY

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Goss, in the testimony of Mr. Edward A. O'Neal he made the recommendation to increase the workweek to 54 hours. Has that been given any consideration by your group?

Mr. Goss. Our group has said that if we should increase the workweek to 54 hours, without the time and a half for overtime above 40 hours, we believe it would shake loose enough men to serve agriculture, and if we could have a price structure that would enable us to employ those men, the problem would be largely solved.

Mr. SNYDER. When you talk about that, you talk about the impossible.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That may be impossible for citizens of the gentleman's great State of Pennsylvania, especially industrial workers. The farmers of Oklahoma, and I am sure the same is true in several other Southern and Midwestern States, are working much longer hours than that and I might add they are not out on a strike or absenting themselves with week-end hangovers. The fact is our farmers who must feed our own Nation as well as our allies, are working overtime and not complaining.

Mr. SNYDER. I did it for some years. I would not be in Congress if I had not done it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes, the gentleman is still a hard worker and I think it is only fair to say that every member of the Committee on Appropriations, especially since the beginning of the present emergency has been working far in excess of 48 hours per week.

Mr. GOSS. Our people put in an average of something over 70 hours.

Mr. SNYDER. I know it.

DRAFT DEFERMENT FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOR

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Goss, I would like to ask you whether this might not be an approach to a solution of this problem from a different angle; that is to say, by deferments from the draft by reexamination of the Army and Navy rolls of men who are in the service in the United States who might be released to work in agriculture. To what extent do you think that would build up a reservoir to meet the situation?

Mr. GOSS. The present program for deferments, if carried out according to the purpose of the Selective Service, is probably meeting most of the problem from the draft, although in many areas they are not now carrying out the regulations in the spirit in which they are drawn. That, however, can be fixed, we believe.

The return of men from the service would help materially. We do not know how much, but, as has been pointed out, about two men have gone into industry for every man who has gone into the armed services. So we believe there must be something more than that before we are put in a position to produce to the maximum.

Now, I want to call attention to this. We have produced the biggest crop in history, it is true, but we are asked to produce more with less machinery and with less fertilizer; and it is going to take more men than we had when we were producing the biggest crop, because we were all working to the limit of our capacity.

Mr. LUDLOW. Have your farm organizations taken that matter up with the Commander in Chief, the Director of Selective Service, or any authority, looking toward meeting the situation by that approach?

Mr. GOSS. We have, and we have not received any encouragement, unless it is from Congressmen.

RESTRICTION OF UTILIZATION OF MEXICAN LABOR

Mr. LUDLOW. There was some reference made to restrictions, without defining it definitely, on Mexican labor in the United States. You spoke about impossible restrictions that had been imposed for preventing the utilization of that labor. What were those restrictions?

Mr. GOSS. Some on wages, minimum hours, some on living conditions, which were impossible to comply with.

Mr. LUDLOW. You mean those conditions were substandard or overstandard. We had some testimony that they were paying some laborers a dollar a meal or $3 a day for subsistence while en route. That seemed to be pretty high. I wondered just what the trouble was.

Mr. GOSS. Well, there is no such thing as a standard wage or standard hours in America. It depends on where they work and what they do. This agreement assumed that the same standards would fit all sections of the country. In some sections of the country the Mexican

agreement was workable. In others it was not, because prices and living conditions just were not available to meet the demands of that agreement.

One of the problems that we have is trying to set up one standard and making it apply in all sections of the country. We think that is one of the great causes of the break-down of our present labor program.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Tarver.

USE OF ARMY UNITS AS EMERGENCY FARM LABOR

Mr. TARVER. Have the farm organizations entered into any consideration of the plan of the Army to send organized units into areas where there is a critical shortage of labor to undertake to relieve the conditions brought about by the shortage? There is a plan to send them in as units of the Army, under the command of their officers. Do you think there is anything practical about that plan?

Mr. GOSS. I cannot speak for the other farm organizations. We have given some consideration to it. We do not think it is practical except in cases of some types of harvest or possibly some type of planting and sowing as an emergency.

Mr. TARVER. I am wondering just how much the Department of Agriculture knows about what is being done and is being contemplated by the Army. We had the Secretary of Agriculture before our subcommittee on February 15, and I asked him about the possibility of the placing into effect of that plan. I had information to the effect that it was contemplated.

He said he had never heard of it, and he did not know that anything of that sort was contemplated. Within 2 days orders were issued by the Army carrying out such a plan. I am trying to find out if the Army is trying to satisfy labor needs without consultation with the Department of Agriculture.

Do you know whether they are working in harmony or not?

Mr. GOSS. I cannot tell you that, but I do know that in Washington and Oregon last year the farmers went to the commanding officer, and he did permit men to go out and help them on the berry harvest. Except for that there would not be any berries today.

Mr. TARVER. Do you know whether it was under the command of their officers as a company or regiment, as the case might be?

Mr. GOSS. No. They had leave and went out and were paid wages on top of their $30 a month, or whatever it was.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, that is a different thing from what I have been discussing.

Mr. GOSS. That is right.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to make one statement off the record?

(Mr. Tarver made a statement off the record.)

The Chair recognizes Mr. Hope.

Mr. HOPE. I would like to ask Mr. Goss one question.

FACILITIES OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO BE UTILIZED

You spoke about setting up a new agency in the Department of Agriculture to handle the labor problem. I just wondered if you contemplated having a separate agency go down to the counties, or would you use existing agencies in the counties and local communities?

The reason I ask that is that the complaints I get from farmers are that there are so many agencies in each county that are handling some phase of the farm situation that they spend a lot of their time and gasoline and rubber in getting around and signing up papers and meeting with these different agencies. I would certainly hope that it would not be necessary to set up another agency in the county to handle the situation.

Mr. Goss. That is our thought, Mr. Hope. We had in our proposal that it should be so organized as to avoid duplication in field offices and personnel. We had that very thought in mind.

Mr. Hope. That would go clear down into the county, too. You would think there would be an advantage in utilizing some of the present agencies in the county.

Mr. Goss. Absolutely, and some of those details we have not had time to work out so we could bring in a united agreement as to what should be done.

May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Tarver has extended the responsibility still further. I do not know whether Wednesday morning is going to be time enough or not.

The Chairman. Mr. Andresen.

FARM LABOR PROBLEM

Mr. Andresen. I might make a short statement, coming from a district or an area of the country where we have diversified farming and where we need all-around-year labor.

There are two types of farming and two types of labor problems with reference to agriculture. By and large, most of the farms in the country are family-sized farms, wherein the members of the family have conducted the farming operations throughout the year, and then in the harvest season they have supplemented their labor requirements by hiring transients and other people.

Then we have the commercial-type farming, where they must have seasonal labor, and that goes for vegetable production and in the wheat and corn areas where they operate on a commercial basis. Through the dairy sections we need all-around-year labor.

A good many of the boys on the farms who helped operate them have been taken into the service. Our problem is to get permanent individuals and skilled individuals to come in and take their places. We cannot do it. We cannot get the labor because, in the first place, the farmers cannot afford to pay the price for labor due to competition with defense industries. In the second place, it is pretty hard to get men who are not skilled to come out and milk your cows and take care of the work that requires long hours and a lot of detail.

The Secretary of Agriculture has set up a standard. He says if a dairy farmer has 8 milk cows, that is 1 unit and requires the services of 1 man. There are over 25,000,000 milk cows in the country, which would mean you would have to have over 3,000,000 milkers to take care of those 25,000,000 milk cows.

Approximately 3,600,000 men have been taken off the farms, both the farm boys and the usual labor, two-thirds of whom have gone into industry, attracted by the higher wages, and the other third of whom have gone into the Army or the Navy.

It looks to me as if this request for $65,000,000, if it is spent as some of them figure out they are going to spend it, will result in just creating another large bureau without really accomplishing any results. I think we have enough bureaus here now.

We started in a year ago, in our Committee on Agriculture, to discuss the manpower problem with Secretary Wickard and with Mr. McNutt and with Mr. Hershey, but at that time they did not feel that there would be any threat to the manpower situation or in the production of food, and they did not do anything about it until in October, and then it was too late.

Any action that you take now is too late to accomplish the desired result, because once you remove the skilled man and try to bring in others who are not skilled, you will not get satisfactory results.

This idea of taking large units of men in the Army and putting them out on the farm, under command, to do the farm work, is all crazy. If they want to do something, they can furlough the men who are willing to go out on the farms, and let them go back to their areas and do the work.

We have another group that can do a lot in farm work, and that is the younger group, growing up now. Many of them will reach the age of 18 pretty soon. Those, I think, should be given deferment when it is shown that they are essential to the operation of a farm.

If you saw the Herald this morning—maybe some of you saw it—you read where a community out in Idaho was unable to get milk, because the man was unable to get labor to milk the cows. The police in that community went over and got milk in Boise, Idaho, and the police were distributing that milk.

Dairymen all over the country, and particularly through the west coast and through our section, are selling off their herds and reducing the size of their herds, because they cannot get labor.

It looks to me as if we are going to have a reduction of approximately 20 percent in dairy products this year, largely because, not of the price, but because you do not have the manpower with which to produce it. You will find that situation is going to be true generally throughout the country in most essential foods.

The canning industry has its problem. So has every other industry. It all demonstrates to me that when these inexperienced key men who are trying to run the show down here put their finger into something they do not know anything about, they make chaos out of the entire business.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will you permit me to ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Woodrum.

Mr. WOODRUM. I know the subcommittee appreciates not only your interest, but the rather expert advice of you and Mr. Hope. The text which is before us came here just a couple of weeks ago. We have been working on this appropriation of $65,000,000 to met this farm labor situation.

I am sure I can say that the committee went far enough to be of the unanimous opinion that it was not exactly a workable scheme, and therefore we are where we are today. We realize the critical urgency of the situation, but we are not satisfied with the particular program proposed. We are all in accord on that.

You feel that way, do you not?

Mr. ANDRESEN. Certainly.

Mr. WOODRUM. This scheme to send high-school boys, as outlined in this program, would not be very workable; and if we should do something, we ought to do something practical.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Let me point out what they have done in the last 2 years in my community. In Goodhue, Minn., which is a small village, probably about 1,200 people, the merchants, on a voluntary basis, got together, closed their stores, and went out and helped the farmers in their harvest. It is a rural community, having diversified farming, and it was just during the harvest period that they did that.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. This is off the record.

(Mr. Tarver made a statement off the record.)

Mr. ANDRESEN. The danger with the proposal before the committee is this: that they are building from the top down instead of building from the bottom up. If there is some way we can work out a plan where you can get a lot of voluntary help in the communities throughout the country to work with the Extension Service or some other agency, where you do not have to spend a lot of money for high-priced executives and administrators, you will be giving us a real service. Otherwise I think I would not vote for this the way it stands today.

Mr. HOPE. I just wanted to ask Mr. Andresen if he does not think that a lot of this problem can be handled not only locally, as you suggested—and I am in hearty agreement with what he says on that—but that the States and the counties can also do a great deal within those areas, a great deal more than we could do with some set-up here in Washington.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Oh, there is no question about that.

Mr. HOPE. Some of the States are doing it.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Of course, I have not seen a break-down of how they are going to spend this money, so I could not pass on these various things; but it looks to me, from what I do know about it, that they are starting to build a big organization from the top down, something like the Farm Security, where they have a lot of personnel drawing big salaries and riding around the country telling people how to live and what to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ditter.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Goss, are the organizations in agreement or disagreement on that which I believe was a critical observation, the attempt to impose social reforms as a part of this program?

Mr. GOSS. We are in agreement.

Mr. DITTER. There is complete unanimity on that?

Mr. GOSS. Yes, sir.

Is there anything else that Mr. Andresen wanted to say?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I just wanted to ask my friend from Michigan a question. Would you be willing to make it as attractive for the men to go on the farm as it has been made attractive by the Government for them to go and work in the factories?

Mr. RABAUT. Certainly, I would.

Mr. ANDRESEN. That would solve the problem.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me say here that in mentioning industrial workers with their week-end hang-overs a few moments ago I meant no reflection on the average industrial worker. Generally,

they are doing a good, efficient job. The average industrial worker is patriotic, loyal, diligent and true to his or her trust. The fact remains, however, that approximately 10 percent of the industrial workers still insist on absenting themselves from work. These absentees have lost enough man-hours in the shipyards alone to construct 42 merchant ships in the last 12 months. In the airplane factories the same loss of man-hours would construct, as I recall, 4,004 medium-sized bombers. This is a serious situation that Congress cannot afford to ignore or pass over lightly.

Now, I desire to ask Mr. Goss another question or two preceding which I would like to make a brief observation.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Johnson.

DIRECTIVES OF WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION TO DRAFT BOARDS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Goss, I think you said a while ago that these directives of the Manpower Commission and of General Hershey had been worked out fairly satisfactorily.

Mr. GOSS. I think that is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. When Mr. McNutt and General Hershey were before the committee a few days ago, as I recall, they said they had conferred with the several farm organizations in issuing directives to draft boards. Remembering that General Hershey has issued a number of directives to the boards I must confess I am a little curious to know just which of you or your organizations collaborated on or participated in.

For instance, there was sent out a little 16-page directive in connection with and in explanation of the so-called Tydings amendment. You recall that amendment merely permitted the local draft boards by the use of the word "may" to defer farm workers whom they considered essential. Every directive sent out by General Hershey's office has had the effect of confusing rather than clarifying the law.

In Oklahoma we have many draft boards composed primarily of farmers. They are extremely reluctant to defer their farm boys.

Moreover very few farmers, unless they happen to be heads of families, will ask for or permit themselves to be deferred. As a result they are stripping the farm areas of men who are really essential to the battle of production.

For more than a year I have been repeatedly calling attention to the Secretary of Agriculture, the War Production Boared and the Manpower Commission to the serious threat of a food shortage. Unless some definite action is taken to stop this gigantic drain of manpower from the farms in the near future instead of the farmers being able to increase their production in 1943 there is actually going to be a serious under-production.

Now, I would like to submit one or two questions.

Mr. TARVER. Do you not think that the only remedy is to get the Army to furlough these farm workers?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Of course, that would help and certainly, that ought to be done. But, of course, it would only apply to men who are actually from the farm and who are still on duty in the United States. It will help tremendously to defer men and permit them to go back to the farm to work during the planting and harvesting seasons, but, certainly that will not solve the problem.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Oklahoma submitted his question? Have you submitted your question and had your answer?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, I had several problem questions in mind. We all appreciate the seriousness of the farm problem. Considering the confusing directives from General Hershey and the present shortage of manpower on the farm, what definite recommendations can you make to this committee and this Congress to do about it now? You might also advise the committee if it is true that you sat in with General Hershey and had a part in writing all those directives that seem to have somewhat confused the draft boards.

Mr. GOSS. In regard to the question as to what conferences we have had and where we have sat in them, we had conferences before the Tydings amendment and after the Tydings amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Did you also have a part in writing the so-called Tydings amendment?

Mr. GOSS. No. We suggested the general approach to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, I am glad to know that you did not have a hand in its actual construction. Of course, you know it is about as clear as mud. Now what about that 16-page pamphlet issued to the draft boards by General Hershey? Did you have a hand in writing that conglomerated statement that attempted to define the meaning of the Tydings amendment?

Mr. GOSS. It needed some definition, and General Hershey went to the Department of Agriculture to find out what was an essential man. They set up a 16-point unit, and that unit was set up without any discussion with the farm organizations as to essential work.

We took it up with them and pointed out many of the defects, and they revised it and set up an 8-point unit with a 16-point goal, and we believe that is about right.

However, the draft boards in the field have difficulty in interpreting it, as you said. I had a case come in just last Saturday where a draft board would not defer the farm hands of a man who had approximately 2,000 hogs, because he did not raise all the feed used for the hogs himself on the farm.

I took it up with Colonel Coatsworth who is on General Hershey's staff, and he said, "That is all wrong."

I said, "Then your instructions to your boards are wrong, because they do not understand it."

Having sat with them and read the instructions, I do not see that there are very many reasons why they do not understand it, but the fact is that they do not. I think the only way that can be corrected is to take it up as these difficulties arise and correct them piece by piece.

I think it is getting very much better out on the farm although we still have quite a deal of trouble.

NUMBER OF WORKERS NEEDED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Goss, let me ask you this: As I understand this program, it is designed to cover about 50,000 workers for all-year-round work, presumably on dairy farms.

Mr. GOSS. I believe it was 42,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am just using round figures; and about 350,000 seasonal workers ostensibly to pick berries and harvest tomatoes; and

to make provision for 3,000,000 people for general farm work, including men, women, young men, and young women.

Is that your estimate of this over-all program?

Mr. Goss. That is approximately as we understand it. Of course, there are some conscientious objectors and some war prisoners and some odds and ends, but approximately, I think, you have stated it correctly.

Mr. Dirksen. Is it not your idea that, notwithstanding any disposition that the Extension Service may have for or against handling such a program, if they are the people to handle it, because of their diffusion through the country, they ought to be compelled to take it, if they are the people who can do it?

Mr. Goss. I would say "Yes," Mr. Dirksen, but there are some phases of it which we are not sure whether they are the best people to handle, such as the compacts for Mexican labor and moving from State to State, for example. There may be better agencies which are better equipped to do that in cooperation with Extension Service.

Mr. Dirksen. But that would be only a very small part of the whole program, as I understand.

Mr. Goss. It is the part that requires moving into new and untried fields and the expenditure of a large amount of money that gives us a good deal of concern.

Mr. Dirksen. Do you know how many Mexicans were brought in under this treaty negotiated with the State Department?

Mr. Goss. No.

Mr. Dirksen. Do you know, Mr. Ogg?

Mr. Ogg. I do not know the recent figure. It is a small quantity.

Mr. Wigglesworth. I think the total is about 50,000.

Mr. Ogg. No. That is the maximum of what they are seeking to get.

Mr. Dirksen. The figure I saw was about 6,000.

Mr. Ogg. I think that is about right.

Mr. Dirksen. Assuming that the figure of 50,000 is the number they expect to get, that is a very small percentage of the whole program. Therefor it is a problem with reference to essential types of agriculture, rather than with reference to the persons we import from Mexico.

Mr. Goss. Yes. That is our biggest problem. There is no question about that.

ORGANIZATION OF EXTENSION SERVICE

Mr. Dirksen. Mr. Chairman, I would like to leave this one observation, in case I have no chance to do so later.

We have had the Extension Service before the subcommittee, and I marvel at the organization they set up. First they have a State director in every one of the 48 States, usually in the agricultural colleges. Then they have a State administrative staff and a supervisory staff. Then they have a county agricultural agent and a county home administration agent in every county. In addition to that they have a county club agent.

Their testimony before us indicates that they are now serving nearly 8,000,000 people on the farms, and, in addition to that, they have trained 650,000 neighborhood leaders, or they are in process of training them now or have contacts with them.

Their testimony before us was that they have approximately 2½, on the average, technically trained extension workers per county. If that is true, here is already a manufactured organization that has been in the field for a long time; and if this thing is to be decentralized, there is the agency that would appear to be the logical one to do it.

I leave those facts because that is the latest word we have had from the Extension Service before our subcommittee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I wonder if we could not have the benefit of the information that Mr. Goss says Mr. Ogg is working on.

SHORTAGE OF LABOR FOR PROCESSING AND PACKAGING AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Benson, do you have any further statement you would like to make?

Mr. BENSON. I would like to comment on one question that was asked Mr. Goss, if I may, regarding this manpower problem.

We are finding now that a very serious bottleneck is developing not on the farm, but after the commodity leaves the farm, in the packaging and the first processing stage and also in the distribution of farm supplies to the farmer.

It was intended that there be provision for the deferment of men engaged in essential jobs, and certain occupational bulletins were prepared for this purpose, but they have been entirely inadequate, and we are finding a lot of complaints coming from farmers now that they cannot even get a part of their plow welded because all of the welders have gone. Transportation is breaking down in some of the local communities, and that is true of other essential services that are necessary to keep the farm plant operating. Serious bottlenecks are developing in that regard.

FILLING OF QUOTAS BY LOCAL DRAFT BOARDS

There is one other phase to this manpower problem that I think is serious, and something should be done about it. These local boards are pretty much a law unto themselves. They get these bulletins, but they do not have to follow them. At the same time, they get quotas, and they do not have to follow the quotas, either, but they apparently do not know that.

They always use the excuse, when a man is entitled to deferment and they induct him into the service, "Well, we have a quota," when, as a matter of fact, if I am correctly informed—and I am sure I am—if the men in the county are entitled to deferment, that local draft board does not have to induct a man.

If that information was gotten over to our draft boards generally, it would give a lot of relief to the farmers of our country, We have attempted to do it directly with regard to our own people, but a farmer is very hesitant to insist on the deferment of his own son, for patriotic reasons, and so on; but if the draft boards knew that they were obligated to defer those people, it might be different.

Mr. LUDLOW. You say the draft boards should give consideration to deferments according to the directives issued. Of course, it would be more or less of a guess with me, but from the reports we get, very few are giving proper deferments to either farm workers or men in

essential occupations, because the draft boards feel they have a quota to fill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. You have put your hand on the vital spot. I have letters from draft boards who say that, while they have read that directive, and they admit they could defer them, they have a quota for 175 men, or whatever it is, "and I have never failed yet to send my quota." He says it boastingly. They think that is No. 1. All the other rules and regulations go out the window except the desire to fill their quota. That is what they are doing.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hope.

Mr. HOPE. I would like to ask Mr. Benson a question in that connection, to see if his observation has been the same as mine. I think in a good many cases the local draft boards are pretty cognizant of what the regulations are, but they are under enough local pressure that they hesitate about deferring farm boys now because a year ago or 6 months or 3 months ago they sent a lot of farm boys into the Army. It is rather tough on them to defer a farm boy living across the road from one they sent into the Army 6 months ago. I think there is a lot of local pressure that is being exerted on the draft boards.

Speaking with regard to Mr. Johnson's statement, I know that in Kansas our State director of Selective Service more than 6 weeks ago sent a directive to all the local boards, in which he told them that they did not have to fill their quotas, and they were supposed to follow this directive with respect to deferment and classification of farm workers.

However, they are still sending farm boys into the Army after that directive. They have that information, and they are still sending some farm boys.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I think there is one point that might be cleared up in that connection. When they call a farm boy he does not like to appeal, and he does not want his parents to appeal. They are afraid that they will be characterized as slackers, and there is no one to represent them.

It has been suggested to the Secretary, and it is now under consideration, that the chairman of the county war board put in the case for the farm boy, even though he does not give his consent. In other words, it is a function of the county war board to preserve men on the farm and they should present the case of that boy's value to the war effort, whether it is greater on the farm or at the front.

The CHAIRMAN. Some such step should be taken.

Mr. GOSS. I believe that is under consideration.

Mr. TABER. Let me ask you a general question. I am going to hand you this sheet of paper, so you will have it, but I want to say this for the record. I would like to have you men come here prepared to tell us on Wednesday where and in what percentage of the cases the Extension Service will be able to function on the labor problem and where it will not, as far as you can.

I also would like to have you prepare to answer this question on Wednesday: Could not most of them do what needs to be done with very little extra help in their places? I would like to have you prepare the answers to those questions Wednesday, and I am going to hand it to you and let you look it over.

INADEQUACY OF DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAM

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ogg, have you any statement to make?

STATEMENT OF W. R. OGG, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, NATIONAL FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. OGG. Yes, in line with your request and the statement that Mr. Goss has made.

With your permission, I would like first to put in the record evidence which I think will have a very pertinent bearing on the request which the Department has sent over, which I think will establish beyond question the impractical, unworkable character of the present program as it is now being carried out, and that it will illustrate the impractical character of a considerable portion of the program which the Department of Agriculture has sent over.

Following that, if I may, I would like to say this off the record.

(Mr. Ogg made a statement off the record.)

The CHAIRMAN. What is the length of the statement that you have, or the evidence which you will submit?

Mr. OGG. I have several documents here that I was going to comment on very briefly and offer them to you.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee: Speaking for the American Farm Bureau Federation, we feel that the present program of recruiting and placing farm labor is being very badly bungled, that it is not adequate to do the job, and that the best evidence of that is what has happened up to this date. We have already lost very considerable quantities of food and fiber because of the bungling of the farm labor recruitment program.

I have here a telegram from Phoenix, Ariz., from the secretary of the Arizona Farm Bureau Federation, which reads as follows:

> Gross loss in six counties on alfalfa, long-staple cotton, and upland cotton is $4,300,000. Figures conservative and based upon university and other authoritative sources. Supporting exhibits attached.

I have that supporting exhibit here, which reviews their difficulties with the Farm Security Administration in recruiting this labor and which itemizes the losses that have occurred. I would like to insert the following excerpt from this statement:

THE ARIZONA FARM LABOR SITUATION BY ARIZONA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

FEBRUARY 17, 1943.

This memorandum and statement of fact is given for the purpose of setting forth:

1. Arizona agricultural production for 1942.
2. The loss to agricultural producers and to the war effort because of an inadequate supply of labor to care for and harvest the 1942 crop.
3. History of attempts to secure adequate labor in 1942.
4. Lack of cooperation by Federal agencies.
5. Present outlook and future needs.
6. Recommendation relative to the securing of necessary labor for 1943 production.

ARIZONA AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN 1942

Exhibit "A" attached hereto is Bulletin No. 188, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Arizona, and entitled, "Arizona Agriculture, 1943" (Production, Income, and Costs).

It should be noted that the high record of 750,000 acres was established in 1942. That record was due to the patriotic spirit of Arizona agriculture in an attempt to aid in the war effort by the production of food and fiber.

It should also be noted that an all-time high was established in beef produced. That record was largely due to two reasons; (1) extreme drought conditions in the range lands forcing a clean-up of many cattle outfits and; (2) the sale of large importations of Mexican cattle previously imported but reported as sales in 1942.

It is an outstanding fact that the gross sales of agricultural production for the State showed an all-time high of $107,000,000, as compared with $80,000,000 for 1941 and an average of $47,400,000 for the years 1932–41.

That large gross return was made possible by the herculean physical effort of the Arizona farm folk with the aid of ample irrigation water, ideal climatic conditions, and a minimum of pests. However, the increased value of gross sales together with the enforced sale of cattle (as hereinafter noted) were the major contributing factors to increased agricultural returns.

As a matter of fact the volume of produced food and fiber, considering all factors, was highly disappointing. The one outstanding retardant factor was an inadequate supply of agricultural labor.

Approximately $4,360,000 of agricultural production was lost to the war effort in the production of two crops (cotton and alfalfa) because of the scarcity of farm labor. That loss is set forth as follows:

AGRICULTURAL LOSSES DUE TO INADEQUATE FARM LABOR SUPPLY

Cotton.—Extremely heavy losses were incurred in the production. That loss was particularly regrettable regarding the American-Egyptian variety, because Arizona produces from 60 to 70 percent of that vital war commodity. Furthermore, the loss to that cotton cannot be measured in dollars and cents because the deterioration of quality due to inability to secure pickers, made large quantities of that cotton unfit for military use.

According to a release by the Arizona Farmers Production Committee, dated February 15, 1943, attached hereto as exhibit "B," 22 percent of the cotton was not picked on February 1, 1943.

Due to inclement weather since that date very slow picking progress has been made. Many farmers are now turning cattle into the cottonfields in order to salvage as much of the crop as possible. Other producers are attempting to salvage their crop by "snapping." However, such method reduces the grade of the high-class cotton grown in this area.

A major item of loss in the cotton operation is due to the fact that delayed picking caused wastage and lower grades and caused some cotton to fall to so a low a grade that it cannot be accepted in the Government loan.

The United States Department of Agriculture War Board and Agricultural Adjustment Administration reported a loss of 7,500 bales of American-Egyptian cotton. Twelve and a half percent is a very conservative estimate of the loss of upland cotton. This figure is arrived at after contact with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, University of Arizona specialists, and producers.

Alfalfa hay losses.—Arizona is one of the Nation's highest yielding areas of alfalfa hay. In most areas it grows throughout the year with an average yield in excess of 5 tons per acre.

In 1942 there were 205,000 acres in production. The normal volume of hay from that acreage would be 1,025,000 tons of hay. However, but 497,000 tons were produced in 1942 or 528,000 tons less than might have been baled.

Much of that 528,000 tons of hay was pastured and but a minor part can be charged as loss due to lack of farm labor. Nevertheless, a minimum of fifty to seventy thousands of tons was lost because of labor shortages. In addition to the actual loss of hay, terrific losses were incurred because of the lower quality of hay baled.

Using the average gross sale price, $23 (exhibit "A") and the minimum loss estimated at 50,000 tons, the producers took a $1,150,000 gross loss on hay because of the labor situation without making any allowance for loss due to lowered quality.

Gross loss on cotton and alfalfa.—The gross loss on alfalfa, upland cotton and American-Egyptian as set forth are ultra conservative. The price figures used are found in exhibit "A".

Crop	Volume price	Gross loss
Alfalfa hay, 50,000 tons (per ton)	$23	$1, 150, 000
American-Egyptian cotton, 7,500 bales (per bale)	215	1, 612, 500
Upland cotton, 17,750 bales (per bale)	90	1, 597, 500
Gross cotton and alfalfa loss		4, 360, 000

Loss of other commodities.—A complete résumé of loss of other agricultural commodities vital to the war effort is being compiled from data being secured from the various counties. No effort is now being made to even approximate the volume of that loss. Nevertheless, data at hand indicates a staggering volume. The other losses include those from dairying, livestock production, and feeding operations, vegetable production (a large volume of which was plowed under), citrus, fruit, grains, and sorghums.

There is also, a very definite loss to future agricultural production due to the improper cultivation of ground, the increase of weeds, uncleaned irrigation ditches and other uncompleted tasks which must be done if crops are to be produced in 1943.

LACK OF COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

The crop losses of 1942 are directly chargeable to lack of cooperation on the part of Federal Agencies—agencies who requested increased production and agencies whose duty it was to assist in solving the labor problems.

In fact, all those agencies were advised of the coming labor difficulties in 1941, when the Arizona Farm Bureau Federation et al. filed an application to import 18,000 Mexican farm laborers. That application was rejected by the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization. It should be also noted that the application did not receive the support of a single department or bureau in Washington.

Facts and surveys were presented to Washington authorities showing the labor situation and labor trends but all such data was ignored. Exhibit C attached was one of the exhibits filed in connection with requests for future consideration of Arizona's labor problem. Exhibit C pointed out the sign posts for what was to follow:

Goals established for 1942.—Secretary Wickard, at a meeting at Salt Lake City, shortly after Pearl Harbor, established goals for Arizona agriculture. Those goals were accepted, "providing however, agricultural labor is made available by agencies of the Federal Government"—see page 1, exhibit D which is a résumé of a senatorial farm labor hearing held in Phoenix, Ariz., November 19, 1942.

The implied promise of the Secretary of Agriculture was not kept.

Agriculture attempts to secure Washington cooperation.—During the spring and early summer of 1942, this organization pointed out the seriousness of the labor situation and asked all Federal agencies including the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, War Board, Farm Security Administration, and the Farm Placement Division, United States Employment Service to study the situation. Also the University of Arizona was asked to make a labor survey.

The University of Arizona issued mimeographed progress reports of that survey which were supplied to all interested parties. Also all interested parties concurred in the findings of that survey at meetings held from time to time.

The findings of that survey were compiled into Bulletin No. 186, Wanted—Manpower for Arizona Farms, University of Arizona, November 1942, attached hereto as exhibit E.

The basic facts as set forth in exhibits A, B, C, D, and E attached were presented to all interested departments in Washington in May 1942, by an Arizona delegation which spoke for the entire agriculture of the State as well as representing New Mexico. In this presentation, they cooperated with agricultural representatives of the beet-sugar industry.

At the request of Washington, the above delegations were asked to draw a workable plan which would be acceptable to all States. That was done.

All delegations returned to their respective States believing that their plan and recommendations would be followed sufficiently to procure the Mexican labor necessary to harvest crops.

In connection with the request for Mexican labor, it should be pointed out that it was necessary for California, Texas, and Arizona to prove that domestic labor could be not secured. This was done by factual information.

Also, it should be further noted that the Washington office of the United States Employment Service, in spite of all the surveys made by the United States Employment Service in the field, labor was not needed in any of the three States.

At that time, the farm placement of the United States Employment Service of Arizona had compiled a study for Arizona showing a need for 36,000 added migrant employees. It was necessary to secure a photostat of that survey in order to convince the Washington office of the Arizona labor needs as compiled by their own Arizona State office. (Copy of that photostat was filed with the American Farm Bureau Federation, Washington office.)

The same approximate lack of knowledge existed within the Washington office regarding both Texas and California.

Impractical contract submitted.—In order to facilitate the handling of labor in Arizona the Arizona Production Committee was established in order to facilitate that work.

An utterly unworkable, impractical and social minded contract was presented to the above committee. Said contract as presented by the Farm Security Administration bore little if any resemblance to the request made by the various producers representing the Southwestern States at the Washington Conference.

Copies of the hereinbefore contracts and agreements, treaties, and so forth are attached to exhibit D herein.

There was a definite attempt to force the agricultural producers to operate under the social security and wages and hours from which Congress had specifically exempted agricultural producers.

Endless bickering followed, countless meetings held, officials were continuously shuttled from Washington and the regional office at Berkeley but none of those officials had authority to strike the social provisions from the contract.

Finally the Farm Security Administration offices asked that a corporation be formed to deal with the labor problem and the Arizona Cotton Growers Association, Inc., was set up but without results. The association and committee then advised the Farm Security Administration they were through negotiating and advised they make individual contracts with the farmers. This the Farm Security Administration proceeded to do. However, in the meanwhile, the Farm Security had, at great expense, set up recruiting offices in Mexico City, having sent a considerable number of employees to that city for that work.

The Mexican recruitment was stopped on the grounds that Farm Security Administration could secure domestic labor. See exhibit F attached.

Recruitment of domestic labor a farce.—Prior to the Farm Security Administration attempt to recruit domestic labor surveys made in this and other States were conclusive such labor was not available in sufficient quantities. Such proved to be the case.

Not enough domestic labor was brought into the State to scratch the surface of labor needs. To make matters worse most of such labor imported by Farm Security Administration was on a 30-day contract basis and many of them were returned upon the end of 30 days.

As a whole, the imported domestic labor was inefficient, sickly, and highly unsatisfactory.

The administrative cost of this work would doubtless approach a national scandal if all the facts pertinent thereto were made known.

A summary of the above various negotiations will be found in exhibit "D" attached.

Present outlook and future needs.—Exhibit "G" attached is a survey as of February 1, 1943, and made by the University of Arizona on February 15, this organization, the Agriculture Adjustment Administration and United States Department of Agriculture War Board adopted a resolution stating the facts therein were substantially correct.

It will be noted that the need runs from an immediate need of 4,000 additional year-round workers to a peak of 51,045 for December 1943—21,000 workers are now in the State, therefore a total of 30,000 must be imported.

The above number is ultra conservative because full weight is not given to the effect of the now decided armed force of 11,000,000 men.

If the above labor is not forthcoming, agriculture can produce only in proportion to the labor received.

That labor cannot be secured from other States.

RECOMMENDATIONS

At the present time a new organization known as War Commodities, Inc., has been incorporated to secure labor through Government channels. The success of that organization has been limited in securing Mexican labor because Farm

Security Administration is not at present recruiting even though they have an unfilled order for 1,500 and there is immediate need for an additional 2,500 year-round laborers.

Also, the present routine is so impractical it is impossible. The procedure as explained by the War Manpower Commission and Farm Security Administration is as follows:

1. Farm Placement, United States Employment Service, certifies the need of labor to regional office and,
2. Regional office (San Francisco) transmits to War Manpower Commission, Washington, when request is passed upon.
3. If O. K. by War Manpower Commission, request goes to Immigration and Naturalization, Philadelphia, Pa., and if O. K.'d,
4. Sent to War Manpower Commission, Washington and then,
5. To regional office, San Francisco, and,
6. To regional office, Farm Security Administration, San Francisco, and
7. To State director, Phoenix, Ariz., who must certify that there is the need for the requested labor and proper housing is available, and
8. State Director, Farm Security Administration, notifies regional director in San Francisco all is O. K. and,
9. Regional director advises office in Mexico City to start recruiting, and
10. If recruiting is successful, workers will be routed to Arizona—

But when.

Following should be at once set up for the importation of labor from Mexico which is the only known source of labor:

1. The "gates" opened under such restrictions as to provide civil and health protection and for the duration.

A. Such provision will make experienced agricultural workers near the border available and without great expense to the Government.

2. One agency within each State should have full and complete power regarding all matters subject to No. 1 above.
3. One regional office should have coordination powers only over a group of States similarly situated.

If the present impossible red-tape program is not abandoned for a simplified method of control, unbelievable production chaos will inevitably result.

It is true that in World War I, the "border gates" were thrown open with bad social results following the war. The present system is the extreme—no results can be secured.

If food is a prerequisite to winning the war, a continuation of the present system of securing labor will be more damaging than the most effective sabotage.

Respectfully submitted.

ARIZONA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
(Signed) EARL MAHARG,
Executive Secretary.

Now, just recently you read in the papers that the Army was going into Arizona to pick the long-staple cotton and that they were recalled at the request of the Farm Security Administration and the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

I understand that they made the statement that there was adequate labor available through the Farm Security Administration.

I got our State farm bureau leader in Arizona on the telephone to ascertain what the facts are. He told me quite the contrary, that the Farm Security did not have workers available in the cotton area. They had about 600 workers over in the truck area but they needed 2,500 workers in the truck areas, and farmers had filed specific requests for 1,500 which were still unfilled. Yet the troops were recalled because it was alleged that they were not needed.

Frankly, I doubt the advisability, as a regular policy, of sending out companies of troops, except to meet local emergencies, as has been suggested, but I merely cite that instance to show that, regardless of the remedy proposed, the need was not being met, and yet it was represented that the situation was being met. There is 7,500 bales of long-staple cotton still unharvested in the fields which is

being plowed under because farmers have been unable to get sufficient labor and the time has come when they must plant this land again. The loss of this cotton is tragic because it is needed for parachutes for our airmen.

I would like to offer for the record the letter which I received on February 25, 1943, from Mr. Maharg, confirming the situation in Arizona which I have described, and also several clippings from local papers there which relate the difficulties that the farmers in that area have experienced as a result of this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. They will be inserted in the record.

(The letter and clippings referred to are as follows:)

ARIZONA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Phoenix, Ariz., February 25, 1943.

Mr. W. R. OGG,
Director of Research, American Farm Bureau Federation,
Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OGG: Enclosed please find clippings from the Arizona Republic and Phoenix Gazette, both as of January 25. The clippings are being forwarded to you in order that you may know the situation here from a publicity point of view.

The Gazette evidently emanated from Farm Security Administration in Washington in an attempt to get themselves off the spot. The statements made regarding relief given by the Farm Security Administration are incorrect. The 1,920 is the sum total of all Mexican and domestic labor imported. Much of that number was received on the 30-day contract and returned at the expiration of the 30 days.

The sum total of labor imported by the Farm Security Administration did not even scratch the surface of the labor needs. In the past, little cotton is left to be picked after the 15th of January.

For your information, this organization is not in accord with an established principle of having enlisted men do the agricultural work. That plan will not work out successfully, and furthermore, this application would allow continued withdrawals of agricultural workers into the armed services. The application for the use of the Army came from a request made by O. M. Lassen, Chairman of the United States Department of Agriculture War Board and Agriculture Adjustment Administration Committee to Senator Hayden.

It would have filled a useful purpose and saved many producers from going broke if the order had been executed immediately. Apparently the Farm Security Administration is in a hole and is trying to indicate that Arizona has had little if any labor shortages.

The brief we recently filed with you regarding losses is still correct.

We also enclose a letter written by the Casa Grande Farm Bureau which expresses the thinking of the rank and file of our producers in this State. I believe that article will be of interest to you.

Very truly yours,

ARIZONA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
EARL MAHARG, *Executive Secretary.*

[From Phoenix Republic, February 19, 1943]

FARM LABOR RED TAPE AND DELAY RAPPED

ARIZONIANS PROTEST LACK OF WORKERS FROM MEXICO

Indignation and disappointment over the failure of various higher up Government bureau officials to speed the importation of Mexican agricultural workers to relieve the acute situation in the State, was voiced by C. B. Hooper, secretary of the Arizona Agricultural War Commodities, Inc., yesterday.

The protest arose over an Associated Press dispatch from Mexico, D. F., Wednesday stating that the 1,000 farm workers who had been camped in the national stadium there awaiting opportunity to come to the United States to work, had been sent back home.

The Mexican Government spokesman was quoted as saying it could not feed them indefinitely and that all workers requested by the United States had been sent.

"That statement probably is correct," Hooper said. "But the number that American farmers have asked the government to obtain has not been sent.

"In Arizona alone we thought we had 700 workers coming. But red tape and delay by Government agencies charged with expediting the relief of Arizona farmers have brought the whole project to a stop. We cannot blame Mexican officials for sending the workers back home, when our own officials are not lifting a finger to do what was promised.

"Our organization is sending strong telegrams of protest to all Members of the Arizona congressional delegation and is urging all farmers who want aid to do the same."

At the State office of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, deep concern was expressed over the failure of more Mexican help to arrive in the State. It was pointed out that the spring planting season is here and a survey conducted last week by the United States Department of Agriculture War Board and the Arizona Farm Bureau Federation disclosed 4,000 workers are needed at this time.

Mr. Hooper said no criticism was intended to be directed toward local Federal officials who have cooperated in every way possible in bringing in the needed laborers.

[From Washington Post, February 25, 1943]

Soldier Cotton-Picking Delayed

Salt Lake City, February 24 (A. P.).—Ninth Service Command Headquarters reported today the movement of troops for the purpose of picking cotton has been postponed.

The Army last Tuesday said it would permit use of soldiers in Arizona cotton fields.

At Phoenix, Ariz., Maharg, executive secretary of the Arizona Farm Bureau Federation, said the decision to postpone mustering Army personnel into Arizona's unharvested cotton fields meant that approximately 7,500 bales of the war-essential fiber probably would be lost.

Army Cancels Cotton Picking

Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson said today that plans to use soldiers to pick cotton in Arizona were being held up pending an investigation to determine whether a real emergency exists.

"Further investigation has tended to show that it may not be necessary for the Army to harvest the cotton crop.

"It may be found that what looked like an emergency is not an emergency," he said. "We are waiting for confirmation of these facts before proceeding any further with our plans."

Stimson recalled that President Roosevelt at a press conference, said Army men would be used to aid farmers only if a real emergency existed.

A Farm Security Administration spokesman said the Farm Security Administration had sent 1,920 cotton workers into Arizona, and that approximately 600 of them still were there. He said growers had not demonstrated any particular desire to keep all of the workers in Arizona.

The problem of getting workers to complete the picking job is always difficult in all cotton-producing States, he said, because the pickers cannot earn as much on a piece-work basis after most of the cotton has been harvested.

The original announcement that the Army had postponed its plans for sending soldiers into Arizona came from Maj. Gen. Kenyon A. Joyce, commanding general of the ninth service command, at Salt Lake City.

[From Arizona Republic, February 27, 1943]

Cottom Men Blast United States Agencies

DISTRUST OF FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION DECLARED—LABOR SHORTAGE ACTION AGAIN DEMANDED

Representatives of the irrigated cotton-growing areas of west Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, leveled a blistering barrage of criticism at the United States Department of Agriculture's handling of the labor situation and its

Farm Security Administration in particular as they opened a two-day session in Hotel Adams yesterday.

The man who "took it" was Mason Barr, Washington, D. C. delegated as the Department's representative by J. O. Walker, Chief, Agricultural Labor Board, Food Production Administration. Maj. John O. Walker, as Mr. Wickard's personal representative, was to have attended, according to word from Washington, but failed to put in an appearance.

SIDESTEPS QUERIES

Mr. Barr is here, he said, to see if a satisfactory contract for the use of imported domestic or Mexican labor for the next crop season cannot be worked out. He dodged all inquiries as to what can or will be done by the Government, with soldiers or other help, to pick the 15,000 acres of long-staple cotton remaining and approximately 20,000 acres of short-stample cotton that must be harvested immediately or be lost.

With Ben H. Ormand, Cortaro, presiding, Mr. Barr heard a recital of the labor difficulties the farmers have suffered through a harvesting season that should have been over 45 days ago, which speaker after speaker indicated he felt was due to the arbitrary attitude of the Department officials in relation to negotiations for obtaining help from across the border.

CITED AS A FAILURE

J. D. Lee, Safford, where the farmers in desperation signed the farm security contract for the importation of domestic cotton pickers, read a prepared statement that showed the arrangement had been a failure, in their opinion.

The report told of weeks of delay while Department red tape unwound; that the pickers had been misinformed as to what they would need, being told "they did not need any cotton sacks or bedding, or cooking utensils.

"We found a large portion of these workers were unfit for any kind of labor, namely, persons in the last stages of tuberculosis, who were told that Arizona was a mecca for such diseases and that if they could get out here, they might effect a cure, even if they couldn't work. There were active cases of syphilis, confirmed alcoholics and people choked up with asthma, who had not done a day's work in 2 years."

Saying that some good pickers were included with the unfit, he reported that the workers did not work more than 50 percent of the time they could have worked, due to the fact they had all the money they needed or cared to have, resulting in a wastage of manpower.

Representatives from the other States expressed the same views in general, their stores varying to suit the locality, and it was apparent Arizona had been hardest hit by the picker shortage.

All stressed dissatisfaction with the Farm Security Administration methods of obtaining help and the labor contract, which was so bitterly opposed last fall by Arizona farmers in general.

GREEN LIGHT URGED

Mr. Barr explained that the Government felt it could cross State lines to recruit farm labor, where State laws prevented a private individual or even State representatives from so doing.

To this he was answered that the Southwest's experience with labor from Eastern States has shown conclusively such help is of little use in its cotton fields; the Mexican nationals, particularly those living along the border, are thoroughly familiar with conditions here and are the answer to getting cotton harvested.

"Give us the green light. Take off the restrictions the Farm Security Administration, State Department or any other agency have placed on our obtaining Mexicans in the way we used to and we will get all the help necessary in 2 weeks," he was told by one delegate. "All we ask is to be given a chance to take care of ourselves."

POWER QUESTIONED

Eugene Hays, Madera, Calif., said: "All of us want to get this job done and next season's job done. But instead of helping, the Government has placed obstacles in the way of our giving full aid in winning this war. We didn't set them up."

When Mr. Barr said he was prepared to work out a new contract, Clyde Neeley, Tempe, asked him bluntly whether he was empowered to do so, or whether it would have to be submitted to some one higher up in Washington.

"I ask that," Mr. Neeley said, "because we are fed up on being pushed around in this matter. Last fall this contract was discussed time and time again. Your representatives would promise us one thing, but it came up different every time."

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION LACKS TRUST

"We are willing to sign any kind of a reasonable contract," H. S. Casey Abbott, Phoenix, said. "But there has been so much evasion on this matter that we have come to a point where we absolutely do not trust the Farm Security Administration. A contract for the reasonable importation of Mexican labor must be arranged or you cannot count on full cotton production next season."

Earl Maharg, secretary of the Arizona Farm Bureau Federation, gave it as his conviction that only the Mexican cotton pickers will be able to handle next fall's harvest; to look elsewhere is foolish.

The meeting adjourned last night to meet again at 9:30 a. m. today. During the night hours, a special committee of two men from each of the four States was to work out with Mr. Barr a satisfactory labor importation contract. If they are successful, it will be submitted to the entire group today.

Mr. Barr indicated he believed that anything to which he agreed over the contract here, would be approved in Washington.

Mexicans Urged for Farm Aid

Washington, February 26 (A.P.).—Help for Arizona's cotton growers now hinges entirely upon obtaining Mexican labor and whatever transient domestic labor is available, E. W. McFarland, Senator, Democrat, Arizona, said today.

McFarland said congressional delegations were awaiting the outcome of a conference being held in Arizona of cotton growers from West Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California before taking further steps.

HOPE IS HELD

He stated members of the delegations from these States were hoping differences which had hindered importation of Mexican labor in the past could be ironed out with Federal officials attending the meeting.

"Importation of Mexican labor must be made easier," McFarland told reporters. "Some of the objectionable features imposed by Federal agencies must be eliminated before we can hope to solve our agricultural manpower crisis by use of Mexican workers."

JAPS DISCOUNTED

The Senator said he was "not optimistic" about getting material assistance for Arizona cotton growers from use of Japanese in resettlement camps in the State.

His statement followed an announcement, made yesterday by Henry Stimson, Secretary of War, that the Army had postponed plans to provide soldiers to pick cotton in Arizona.

[From: Arizona Republic, February 25, 1943]

Army Quashes Cotton Picking

RENEGING CLOAKED IN MYSTERY—SMALL HOPE LEFT FOR HARVESTING CROP

The presidentially approved order directing soldiers to pick what remains of Arizona's long staple cotton—some 15,000 acres of a vital war material—dissolved last night, apparently into thin air.

Announced with a great flourish in Washington Tuesday, and heralded as the first of a series of similar actions which "will be taken with regard to vital crops elsewhere in the Nation," the Army order went through these phases yesterday:

1. Washington announced that Maj. Gen. Kenyon A. Joyce, commanding general, Ninth Corps Service Command, Fort Douglas, Utah, had been delegated to see that the cotton was picked.

2. Col. Fred M. Logan, commander of the local unit of the Ninth Service Command, was put in charge of furnishing men for the work.

3. Colonel Logan ascertained from O. M. Lassen, chairman of the State United States Department of Agriculture, that requests for help to date totaled 1,200 men.

4. Everybody suddenly stopped talking about the whole project, and wouldn't even discuss the matter. Then—

5. Late yesterday afternoon headquarters of the Ninth Service Command at Salt Lake City suddenly announced the use of troops to pick cotton has been indefinitely postponed.

6. The War Department snapped "No comment," when queried about the Ninth Service Command announcement.

The only thing now left of the vision of getting in the cotton that has stood in the field for months was President Roosevelt's comment Tuesday that he hoped the action would still the clamor in Congress for the armed forces to furlough all experienced farm hands.

Earl Maharg, Arizona Farm Bureau Federation secretary, said that if the Army failed to go through with its announced plan, some 7,500 bales of long staple, used for balloons and parachutes, probably would be lost.

The time virtually has arrived when farmers must prepare their fields for next season's plantings.

Maharg shed one bit of light on the strange situation. He said he understood an Army officer had toured the fields where the cotton still stands—mainly in Maricopa and Pinal Counties—and seemed to have the opinion the crop had been allowed to disintegrate to the point where it was hardly worth picking.

He did not know whether the officer was on an assigned tour of inspection, and whether he was an agricultural authority went undetermined.

Mr. Lassen's only comment was:

"I have heard nothing from my own department on this order, and I do not care to express myself until I have heard something definite."

Mr. OGG. I have a telegram from Mr. Ray B. Wiser, president of the California Farm Bureau Federation, dated December 14, 1942, which reads as follows:

Reports from counties and close contact with situation give us the following crop losses in California due to labor shortage. These approximate losses are conservative and are beyond normal discard of unmarketable products: Apricots 3,000 dry tons or 15 percent loss; peaches 20,000 fresh tons or 5 percent loss; tomatoes 200,000 tons or 25 percent loss; strawberries 2,500 crates per day for 5 weeks or one quarter of crop; peas 25 percent loss; asparagus 3,700 acres or 20 percent of crop; cherries 30 percent loss; sugar beets 7,000 to 9,000 acres lost in spring due to lack of choppers and 10 percent loss in harvest; dairy 5 percent loss over last year despite attempted 10 percent increase in production; slaughter of dairy cows 46 percent above normal; prunes 5 percent loss; vegetables 30 percent loss in both planting and harvesting; cotton loss unknown as harvest not complete but easily 20 percent loss unless labor supplied.

I would like to insert at this point, a letter I have received from Mr. Wiser describing the difficulties experienced by farmers in getting labor because of the incompetence of the Farm Security Administration and its impractical requirements:

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
2161 ALLSTON WAY,
Berkeley, Calif., February 18, 1943.

Mr. W. R. OGG,
Director of Research, American Farm Bureau Federation,
Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OGG: The possibility that Farm Security Administration might become the directing head of the farm-labor program astounds us beyond precedent. The California Farm Bureau Federation has cooperated with Farm Security in its farm tenant purchase program, and I presume that we have as large a percentage of members from Farm Security borrowers as from any other group of farmers in California. We have one county farm bureau president and

many members of boards of directors who have purchased their farms under the Farm Security program.

Likewise, when the matter of the importation of Mexican labor was assigned to Farm Security Administration we cooperated in every way possible to make the program workable and successful. The Farm Security Administration, however, is in disrepute with the vast majority of farmers in California, largely because in all of their programs there has been the underlying tendency toward socialization of agriculture.

Under the Mexican importation program they have advocated and forced organization of farmers in order to take advantage of the program, and every indication now is that if they are to handle farm labor they will do everything possible to develop organization of employers for negotiation and contract purposes and unionization of farm laborers.

Likewise, they continue to advocate regulation of hours, working conditions, wages, and so forth, which may or may not be desirable in periods of peace but should not be forced on farmers under the shortages of war. Their expense of operation of every program undertaken has always been far in excess of what it need be, and the unwieldly mechanics developed for handling projects have slowed down their ability to serve.

I cannot imagine any proposal that could be made that would adversely affect food production in California like an announcement that Farm Security Administration is to be charged with transporting, recruiting, and placing farm labor.

The Administrator of the Farm Security Administration on the west coast has stated on many occasions that they could only import a limited number of Mexican laborers under their program, and also each activity carried on has been on a restrictive basis when in this war period the greatest need is to remove restrictions to allow maximum production. They continuously point out the necessity of determining labor shortages before proceeding on a program to supplement the labor supply. This always indicates, therefore, "too little and too late."

The fact of the matter is, I could not visualize any program that could possibly make more labor available in the year that is ahead than could be utilized, if not in agriculture, then in other war industries in California; and hence the entire effort of all agencies should be on an all-out basis to obtain labor rather than to throw in restrictive regulations that diminish ability to obtain labor.

The present move to give Farm Security Administration more funds appears to us to be an effort to prolong the operation of a Government bureau, which under present conditions is outmoded, unnecessary and undesirable.

It would not be possible to give many specific instances of crop losses caused directly by Farm Security Administration, although their slowness of operation has had this effect. For example, we now have a case of between 200 to 250 acres of unharvested sugar beets in Alameda County, which represent about 3,000 tons. The Holly Sugar Co., who had these beets under contract, had a contract with Farm Security Administration for Mexican labor but this contract expired on December 15, and immediately the Mexicans were transferred to another industry before they had completed harvesting this crop. The result is that these sugar beets are still in the ground.

The cost of importing Mexican laborers by Farm Security Administration has been way out of reason. For example, it has already been reported that they have had more than 50 persons in Mexico recruiting the few hundred Mexicans that were brought in, while probably 2 or 3 men well versed in Mexican relationships could have brought in many times the labor that has been received, and at a fraction of the expense.

Most of the Mexican labor that has been brought in has been satisfactory, which is indicative of itself that many thousands more should have been brought in; but the limiting factor has been largely the arbitrary, unnecessary, unwieldly provisions that Farm Security Administration has promoted as a condition to the employment of Mexican labor.

Agricultural leaders in this State have now come to the conclusion that there is such chaos in Washington in connection with the agricultural labor problem that we will have to set up a State agency for the purpose of handling and supplying of farm labor for the duration of the war. This should have been unnecessary and is undesirable in our opinion, but nevertheless we are wholeheartedly supporting such a program, believing it to be better than anything the Federal Government will have the willingness to provide. The fact remains that the lack of action by Federal agencies on the labor problem is causing a shortage of thousands of tons of food that could and would be produced in California.

We submitted to you some time ago our suggestions and proposals for handling farm labor, in order to make maximum production possible. Those original proposals are as sound now as at any time in the past, but because of the lack of understanding or lack of desire on the part of the Federal Government to carry out any constructive endeavors we have decided to move ahead on a State project.

We are opposed irrevocably to any appropriation for the Farm Security Administration for any purposes other than the original project for which it was established; namely, the rehabilitation of farmers on the land.

Therefore, we urgently request that you oppose any appropriations to Farm Security Administration for the purpose of handling labor problems in any way and, likewise, that you oppose any responsibility being placed on Farm Security Administration in connection with the regulating, transporting, or placing of farm labor.

Yours sincerely,

RAY B. WISER,
President, California Farm Bureau Federation.

RBW:MEB

P. S. Since dictating this it has been reported to us that Farm Security Administration has been in Arizona and New Mexico, as well as California, recruiting men to be used in handling farm labor in anticipation of the approval of this program. Also, from attendances at various meetings, such as the United States Department of Agriculture War Board meetings, there is every indication that officials of Farm Security Administration have known for some weeks that they were to get the farm labor job.

R. B. W.

Mr. TABER. I think, Mr. Ogg, that I might say this, and I think practically every member of the committee is agreed on it, that there is no lack of appreciation of the problem that needs to be met in the farm community, but the thing that we are especially interested in and excited about is how we might do something that might contribute to its solution. We would like to have suggestions along that line more than anything else from you gentlemen.

Am I right, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. That is our problem.

Mr. OGG. I will just offer for the record, some other material, so that you gentlemen will have it, without going into it any further, which will include, I may say, a statement of policy for the recruitment and employment of domestic agricultural workers throughout the United States, which was prepared by the Farm Security Administration and issued by the Department of Agriculture, which shows the type of bureaucratic controls and regulations that somebody asked about a while ago, together with a copy of this form that was referred to by Congressman Johnson, which will illustrate the procedures that were referred to that are interfering with the farmer's ability to produce.

Mr. LUDLOW. Is that Form FSA-502?

Mr. OGG. Yes.

[NOTE.—This form is printed on page 49.]

(The other documents are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF POLICY FOR THE RECRUITMENT AND EMPLOYMENT OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS IN THE UNITED STATES

PART I. DOMESTIC AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

I. PURPOSE

The War Manpower Commission, on June 22, 1942, issued directives aimed to alleviate urgent agricultural labor shortages. Pursuant thereto the Department of Agriculture was assigned the responsibility for administering a program designed

to accomplish this objective. The Farm Security Administration was designated as the agency within the Department of Agriculture to institute such a program and this statement is intended to set forth the policies to be followed.

To effect satisfactory procedures providing for the transportation and effective utilization of domestic agricultural workers in agricultural employment in the United States on a just and equitable basis, it is deemed essential (a) to define the conditions, procedures and methods of recruitment and placement of domestic agricultural workers, (b) to make provision for their transportation from and return to their place of origin, (c) to establish standards of wages, working conditions, periods of employment, housing conditions and related matters, (d) to provide safeguards insuring adequate protection and fair treatment of domestic agricultural workers and members of their families during the periods of their employment and (e) to establish necessary machinery to effectuate the foregoing objectives.

II. POLICIES AND PRINCIPLES

A. General.

1. Domestic agricultural workers shall be recruited and shall be transported exclusively for employment as agricultural workers.

2. Domestic agricultural workers recruited pursuant to the aforementioned program, in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order No. 8802, dated June 25, 1941, shall not suffer discriminatory acts of any kind.

B. Recruitment.

1. There shall be no recuiting of domestic agricultural workers for agricultural employment beyond the local area within which such workers then are or ordinarily are employed unless such workers are not required for essential activities within such local area and unless a specific need for their employment beyond such local area has previously been certified to exist by the United States Employment Service and there shall be no recruiting of domestic agricultural workers for such employment beyond the number certified by the United States Employment Service to be needed in the area for employment.

2. Certification by the United States Employment Service shall be based upon determinations:

(*a*) That a valid and bona fide application for agricultural workers has been made by responsible potential employers of agricultural workers;

(*b*) That the supply of domestic agricultural workers available in the particular area of employment or capable of recruitment by the independent efforts of such potential employers, both in accordance with the standards described in subparagraphs (*c*) and (*e*) hereof, is inadequate to satisfy their need and that efforts to recruit such workers have proven futile;

(*c*) That such potential employers have agreed to meet the standards of wages, working conditions, periods of employment, housing conditions and related requirements prescribed by the Farm Security Administration and contained in agreements between the Farm Security Administration and employers covering the employment of domestic agricultural workers;

(*d*) That adequate housing, health and sanitary facilities, within the limitations of existing conditions, are certified by the Farm Security Administration to be available;

(*e*) That such potential employers have agreed and have indicated an ability to meet the obligations for transportation and other monetary guaranties required by the Farm Security Administration; and

(*f*) That the crops, for the production, harvesting or marketing of which such domestic agricultural workers are requested, are of importance to the war effort.

3. Domestic agricultural workers shall not be transported into a particular area of employment if the effect thereof will lead to the displacement of domestic agricultural workers within such local area, to the impairment of opportunities for agricultural employment of domestic agricultural workers resident within such area or to the reduction of depression of wages for agricultural workers within such area.

4. Domestic agricultural workers shall be recruited, within the local area within which they are resident, for transportation into a particular area of employment by the United States Employment Service with the cooperation and assistance of the Farm Security Administration.

C. Transportation.

1. Domestic agricultural workers and members of their families shall be transported from points of origin within the local areas in which they reside to original points of destination within the particular area of employment and from such points of destination to intermediate points of destination within such or other particular areas of employment and return to their points of origin by facilities duly licensed to transport passengers.

2. Costs of transportation of domestic agricultural workers and members of their families from points of origin to points of destination and from such points of destination to intermediate points of destination and return to points of origin and all subsistence, medical and other necessary services and facilities provided while en route shall be paid for by the Farm Security Administration.

3. Personal belongings of domestic agricultural workers and members of their families to a maximum of 75 pounds per person shall be transported at the cost of the Federal Security Administration.

4. Costs of transportation of domestic agricultural workers, and of members of their families, if the transportation thereof should be necessary, from original or intermediate points of destination within a particular area of employment to actual place of employment upon agricultural lands and return to such original or intermediate points of destination shall be paid for by the employers of such domestic agricultural workers.

D. Wages and conditions of employment.

1. Domestic agricultural workers shall be paid at the prevailing wage rates within the particular area of employment, provided that in no event shall the prevailing wage rates be less than 30 cents per hour and provided, further, that piece work rates shall be so set as to enable the worker of average ability to earn not less than the prevailing wage.

2. Prevailing wage rates shall be established pursuant to evidence adduced at hearings held by, or submitted by interested parties to, wage boards appointed for such purpose by the Secretary of Agriculture and composed of two representatives of the Department of Labor, a representative of the War Manpower Commission and two representatives of the Department of Agriculture.

3. No deduction shall be made for commissions, fees, or for any other charges (but not excluding such deductions as may be required by law) which shall have the effect, directly or indirectly, of reducing the wages received by domestic agricultural workers below those provided for in paragraph 1 above.

4. No minor shall be employed, except in compliance with and as permitted by Federal and State laws and policies, and no children under 16 years of age shall be transported except as members of families of domestic agricultural workers.

5. Housing, sanitary and medical facilities provided domestic agricultural workers and members of their families shall meet reasonable minimum standards and such additional requirements as may be imposed by the Farm Security Administration.

6. Domestic agricultural workers shall not be required to purchase articles or services for consumption or use by them or members of their families at any source not of their own choosing.

7. Domestic agricultural workers transported into particular areas of employment shall enjoy the rights and privileges, with reference to occupational diseases and accidents, as are afforded under Federal and State statutes.

8. The Farm Security Administration, in cooperation with appropriate Federal and State agencies, shall make all necessary provisions for insuring continuous compliance by employers of domestic agricultural workers transported under this program with wage provisions, working conditions, housing, sanitary and other living standards, transportation requirements and all other provisions of employment contracts entered into by such employers and shall provide the necessary machinery for satisfying grievances and resolving disputes.

9. The Farm Security Administration will enter into agreements with domestic agricultural workers transported under this program which will guarantee employment or, in the absence of employment, the making of a minimum subsistence payment of $3 per day, for 75 percent of the work days (Sunday is not a work day) during the period of employment specified in the agreement between the Farm Security Administration and a domestic agricultural worker, provided that the amount of such subsistence payment, if any, as is required to be made under such agreement shall be computed and the payment thereof shall be made

at the end of the period of employment; and such agreements will provide, in addition, in the event of need, for the furnishing of subsistence and shelter during the periods of unemployment within the period of employment specified in the agreement between the Farm Security Administration and a domestic agricultural worker.

10. The agreements entered into by the Farm Security Administration with domestic agricultural workers transported into particular areas of employment and with employers of such domestic agricultural workers will contain such provisions as, in the opinion of the Farm Security Administration, may be necessary to effectuate the objectives of the program.

E. *Publicity.*

The Farm Security Administration will, together with the United States Employment Service and appropriate Federal agencies, give widespread publicity to its program for the transportation of domestic agricultural workers by newspaper statements, radio announcements, and other means.

Part II. Mexican Workers

I. PURPOSE

Pursuant to directives issued by the War Manpower Commission on June 22, 1942, the Department of Agriculture, through the Farm Security Administration, has instituted a program for the transportation of domestic agricultural workers from local areas within which they reside to particular areas of employment. The Department of Agriculture, through the Farm Security Administration, is also instituting a supplementary program in no way superseding the portion of the program relative to the transportation of domestic agricultural workers, for the recruitment and employment within the United States of Mexican workers. The statement of policy and procedures hereinafter outlined are limited in their application to Mexican workers admitted to the United States for employment as agricultural workers, pursuant to the understanding arrived at by the Mexican and United States Governments and only after the United States Employment Service has certified that domestic labor is not available.

To effect satisfactory procedures providing for the transportation and effective utilization of Mexican workers in agricultural employment in the United States on a just and equitable basis, it is deemed essential (a) to define the conditions, procedures, and methods of recruitment and placement of Mexican workers; (b) to make provision for their transportation to the United States and return to Mexico and to control their movement within the United States; (c) to establish standards of wages, working conditions, periods of employment, housing conditions and related matters; (d) to provide safeguards insuring adequate protection and fair treatment of Mexican workers and members of their families while within the United States; (e) to establish necessary machinery to effectuate the foregoing objectives.

II. POLICIES AND PRINCIPLES

A. General.

1. The Mexican and United States Governments understand, with respect to the importation into the United States of Mexican workers for agricultural work that:

(*a*) Mexican workers shall not be subject to the Selective Service Act or to any military service;

(*b*) Mexican workers entering the United States, in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order No. 8802, dated June 25, 1941, shall not suffer from discriminatory acts of any kind;

(*c*) Mexican workers entering the United States shall enjoy the guaranties provided for in article 29 of the Mexican labor law;

2. Mexican workers shall be admitted into the United States, pursuant to the aforementioned understanding, exclusively for employment as agricultural workers and the agreement between the Farm Security Administration and each individual Mexican worker shall specifically provide that such worker may be employed within the United States solely in agricultural work during the period such worker remains within the United States.

B. Recruitment.

1. There shall be no recruiting of Mexican workers for agricultural employment within the United States unless specific need for their employment has previously been certified to exist by the United States Employment Service as pro-

vided in subparagraph 2 hereof and there shall be no recruiting of Mexican workers beyond the number certified by the United States Employment Service to be needed.

2. Certification by the United States Employment Service shall be based upon determinations:

(*a*) That a valid and bona fide application for workers has been made by responsible potential employers of agricultural workers;

(*b*) That the supply of domestic agricultural workers available in the particular area of employment or capable of recruitment from without such area by the United States Employment Service under the program outlined in part I hereof is inadequate to satisfy the need and that efforts to recruit such domestic workers have proven futile;

(*c*) That such potential employers have agreed to meet the standards of wages, working conditions, periods of employment, housing conditions, and related requirements stipulated in the understanding between the Mexican and the United States Governments and contained, pursuant to the provisions hereinbelow set forth, in the agreements between the Farm Security Administration and employers covering the employment of agricultural workers;

(*d*) That adequate housing, health, and sanitary facilities, within the limitation of existing conditions, for the Mexican workers are certified by the Farm Security Administration to be available;

(*e*) That such potential employers have agreed and have indicated an ability to meet the obligations for transportation and other monetary guaranties required by the Farm Security Administration; and.

(*f*) That the crops, for the production, harvesting or marketing of which the Mexican workers are requested, are of importance to the war effort.

3. Mexican workers shall not be permitted to enter the United States for agricultural employment if the effect thereof will lead to the displacement of domestic agricultural workers, to the impairment of opportunities for agricultural employment of domestic agricultural workers or to the reduction or depression of wages for domestic agricultural workers.

4. Mexican workers shall be recruited in Mexico by the Farm Security Administration, with the cooperation and the assistance of the United States Employment Service, and in accordance with such limitations as may be imposed by the Mexican Government pursuant to the aforesaid understanding.

C. Transportation.

1. Mexican workers and members of their families shall be transported from points of origin in Mexico to original points of destination within the United States and from such points of destination to intermediate points of destination and return to their points of origin in Mexico by facilities duly licensed to transport passengers.

2. Costs of transportation of Mexican workers and members of their families from points of origin to points of destination within the United States and from such points of destination to intermediate points of destination and return to Mexico and all subsistence, medical and other necessary services and facilities while en route shall be paid for by the Farm Security Administration.

3. Personal belongings of Mexican workers and of members of their families to a maximu of 35 kiles (77 pounds) per person shall be transported at the cost of the Farm Security Administration.

4. Costs of transportation of Mexican workers, and of members of their families, if the transportation thereof should be necessary, from original or intermediate points of destination within the United States to actual place of employment upon agricultural lands and return to such original or intermediate points of destination shall be paid for by the employers of the Mexican workers.

D. Wages and conditions of employment.

1. Mexican workers shall be paid at the prevailing wage rates within the particular area of employment, provided that no event shall the prevailing wage rates be less than 30 cents per hour and provided, further, that piece work rates shall be so set as to enable a worker of average ability to earn not less than the prevailing wage.

2. The prevailing wage rates shall be those wage rates established for domestic workers by the Department of Agriculture pursuant to the procedure provided for under part I hereof.

3. No deductions shall be made for commissions, fees, or for any other charges (but not excluding such deductions as may be required by law) which shall have

the effect, directly or indirectly, of reducing the wages received by Mexican workers below those provided for in paragraph 1 above.

4. No minor shall be employed, except in compliance with and as permitted by Federal and State laws and policies, and in no event shall any minor under 14 years of age be employed nor any children under 16 years of age be transported except as members of families of Mexican workers.

5. Housing, sanitary and medical facilities and services provided Mexican workers shall meet reasonable minimum standards and such additional requirements as may be imposed by the Farm Security Administration.

6. Mexican workers shall not be required to purchase articles or services for consumption or use by them or members of their families at any source not of their own choosing.

7. Mexican workers shall enjoy the same rights and privileges, insofar as occupational diseases and accidents are concerned, as are afforded domestic agricultural workers under Federal and State statutes.

8. Each group of Mexican workers shall elect their own representatives to deal with employers of agricultural labor provided that all such representatives shall be working members of the group.

9. The Farm Security Administration, in cooperation with appropriate Federal and State agencies, shall make all necessary provisions for insuring continuous compliance by employers of Mexican workers with wage provisions, working conditions, housing, sanitary and other living standards, transportation and all other provisions of employment contracts entered into by such employers and shall provide the necessary machinery for satisfying grievances and resolving disputes.

10. The Farm Security Administration will enter into agreements with Mexican workers transported under this program which will guarantee employment or, in the absence of employment, the making of a minimum subsistence payment of $3 per day, for 75 percent of the workdays (Sunday is not a workday) during the period of employment specified in the agreement between the Farm Security Administration and Mexican workers, provided that the amount of such subsistence payment, if any, as is required to be made under such agreement shall be computed and the payment thereof shall be made at the end of the period of employment; and such agreements will provide, in addition, in the event of need, for the furnishing of subsistence and shelter during the periods of unemployment within the period of employment specified in the agreement between the Farm Security Administration and a Mexican worker.

11. The agreements entered into by the Farm Security Administration with Mexican workers and with employers of such Mexican workers will contain such provisions as, in the opinion of the Farm Security Administration, may be necessary to effectuate the objectives of the program.

Mr. Ogg. At this point I would like to insert also some excerpts from the testimony of several witnesses before the Senate Agricultural Subcommittee investigating Government policies affecting farm production. These growers, representing fruit and vegetable producers in Florida, New Jersey, California, and Idaho, told how farmers have been harrassed and handicapped by the impractical regulations and the incompetent handling of the recruitment and placement of farm labor by the Farm Security Administration.

EXAMPLES FROM TESTIMONY BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, FEBRUARY 22, 1943

FLORIDA

L. L. Chandler, of Goulds, representing winter vegetable growers of south Florida, testified before the Senate Agriculture Committee Monday that the Farm Security Administration was making a national guinea pig of that State with disastrous results to the growers. Mr. Chandler said that growers needed 20,000 workers in the winter crops but F. S. A. supplied only 2,000. In order to get them the farmers had to sign these impractical one-way union labor contracts

whereby the workers were guaranteed minimum wages, maximum hours, fancy housing and sanitation, transportation and feeding, and the farmers were guaranteed nothing. The workers recruited for Chandler's farm were recruited from Natchez, Miss., and represented, he said, "the riffraff of the human family." I quote further from the transcript of the hearing:

I have lived very closely with the Farm Security Administration. I find some very estimable gentlemen here in Washington who have the thing in charge, and who, I think, have done all they can do with the limitations imposed upon them, but somewhere * * * this policy-fixing lays down a reform, socialistic—I don't mean socialistic as to political, but social reform stuff to follow through the Farm Security Administration.

Referring to the Farm Security Administration regulations, Mr. Chandler said: "I condemn them to the fullest extent as being impractical, cumbersome, and dripping with red tape and reform. Apparently social reform is all the Farm Security Administration people have in mind. While our crops wilt and rot they dilly-dally dawdle around with all their foolishness."

Senator BUSHFIELD. Do you think it should be eliminated?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do, yes sir; completely.

Let me just take your time and tell you what happens to a farmer in Dade County. He is told that if he wants labor he must sign a contract, which I guarantee none of you within the sound of my voice as a businesman would sign. * * * The contract then goes along with two pages of details as to organization and their privilege to be heard, and what I must do and must not do with them, all these things which are reform measures. Well and good, we don't care. They can put 3 years of such provisions in there if they want to. We don't care anything about that. We want labor that will work.

There was no way to force them to work. The minute one of these fellows signs up with Farm Security Administration he is a pampered and petted individual. The Government feeds and sleeps him and then spends days chasing around to see what kind of sleeping and cooking facilities and toilets are provided.

I have 28 houses on my farm. They are clean and painted and okayed by the State board of health. Workers have lived in them for years. I charge them no rent. Yet, the Farm Security Administration administrator walked over there and found one toilet that didn't suit him, and condemned the whole quarters. The Government then set up a tent camp less than a mile away with much worse facilities than mine and moved the migrants in at 50 cents a day. When I went to get them the next morning they refused to work, so the Government transported them back to Natchez.

The farmer first has to sign a contract and post a penal bond as to his end of this performance. If the labor is supplied and if this labor on coming to my farm cares to continue the contract, it has the privilege to do so, but if it doesn't want to do it, it suffers but one penalty, the right to further transportation at the hands of the Government.

I saw this labor, white and black, roll up to these camps, roll into the farm, take one look at it and say, "To hell with that kind of work. We won't do that. We came to pick beans." Yet the contract says he came to cultivate tomatoes. But there is no effort whatsoever put out by the Farm Security Administration that results in the first sign of anything that will force that laborer to go and perform his contract.

Now, the Government is supposed not to transport that labor anywhere else. It is supposed to forfeit the right, yet I make the charge that the Government today is transporting that labor, despite the fact that the job is not completed. When the labor just refuses to work and says "I want to go home," they are taking them home, paying their way home.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Who is paying for that?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Government, the taxpayers.

Senator BUSHFIELD. What department of the Government.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Farm Security Administration. As a farmer, though, you first go down and apply at the United States Employment Service. Next that is turned over to the Farm Security Administration office in the local area, transmitted to West Palm Beach, thence over to the United States Employment Service over at West Palm Beach for a clearance, back to the local area right in the same office and on the same desk where it originally began. All the while I need the labor. Then that clears through some of their State or national organizations,

and the United States Employment Service is then told to recruit this labor. They did so in Natchez, Miss. Then back all the way to the first desk again, they report that there is some labor now in Natchez, sitting up there eating at the expense of the Government, waiting to be delivered to Chandler.

Washington then approves, somewhere through the Farm Security Administration up there, and a man is then sent to Natchez, Miss., with instructions, and authority and apparently unlimited means, to move that labor down to me. And when it comes through it may be 2 o'clock in the morning, maybe by bus or train or otherwise, I am never notified until the labor drives up in front of my place on a bus, and there it is mine. It became mine then, and the next morning at 7 o'clock or 8 o'clock, when they are supposed to go to work—or 9 o'clock whatever the time may be—they go to work when the fancy strikes them, and if they don't want to they don't. All the time I am under contract to guarantee that they shall be paid for three-fourths of the time.

I have seen in my own field time and again the Negroes make up their money in a pot and send in to town for a case of I. W. Harper whisky, and drink it in the field and lay around drunk between the bean and tomato rows, and I can't do anything about it. We have seen them in there gambling at the end of the rows, and when a man comes out with a hamper of beans, this Farm Security labor—I am talking about the type of control we are getting—when a man comes out of the field with a hamper of beans one of these fellows will say to him: "Do you want one or two, double or nothing" on the hamper of beans that he is picking, for which I paid him just one-half of the ceiling price of that hamper of beans to get him to pick it.

Now, the loose women of that outfit follow right on out into the field and pick up their men, and it is just a grand orgy, if you please, in which the farmer stands there growing his beans. I walk out and say to the foreman: "Now, look, here is a first picking bean field. That is the best. Can you get this crew to pick these beans?" He goes out and says: "Boys, we have got a patch to pick over here." They will appoint a committee of their own, and they walk over the field, and to use their own expression to me, "To hell with those beans. They aren't worth picking." That bean field today remains unpicked. That field would have picked nearly 100 hampers of beans per acre, and they just wasted.

Senator BUSHFIELD. You lost the crop?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes, sir, because that is a perishable crop.

I plant about 800 acres of tomatoes and beans a year. I invest about $100,000 a year. That is small money, apparently to the Farm Security Administration but it is a lot of money to me. And all the while I am fussing and fighting and fuming with this labor my order and contract is lying on their desk unfulfilled. I sign an order in the early part of December, and I get my labor delivered, such as they did deliver, the 28th of January. I am expected to grow highly perishable crops and cultivate them and harvest and handle them on that basis.

Mr. Chandler estimated that 25 to 35 percent of the winter crop was "absolutely wasted because it could not be picked," and for that portion harvested the growers had to pay up to $10 and $15 a day to get good workers. At the same hearing, Congressman Pat Cannon of Florida supported Chandler's story from first-hand observation and said that Congress had been asleep in "letting such damn foolishness" creep into farm labor procurement policies. He said:

The fault can be charged to those unworkable, untenable policies of a socialistic nature promulgated by bureaucrats who couldn't command three votes if they ran for dogcatcher. * * * There are too many people trying to figure this thing out on paper who never saw a bean field.

NEW JERSEY

Mr. Louis W. Barton, representing the New Jersey Farm Bureau and the New Jersey Horticultural Society, testified that "it was impossible to get any farm work done with the migrant labor shipped into New Jersey by the Farm Security Administration and other Government agencies." He said:

They are hopeless. The more you pay them the less they work, and no good is served by shipping them in here. So far as I am concerned I hope that there is never another one brought into New Jersey.

IDAHO

E. S. Harper, a potato grower of Twin Falls, Idaho, testified before the Senate Agriculture Committee regarding the employment of Japanese farm labor from nearby Japanese relocation camp under Government contracts. He said:

They were inefficient in most respects because they were not farmers, but mostly merchants and fishermen.

We were forced to sign contracts with them which were so ridiculous that we had to guarantee the Japs a bath every night before we could get them on our farms. So, if we didn't have sufficient bathing facilities on our farms we had to take them into town to the barber shops, then bring them back at night so they could have their bath. We were willing to do that as long as they didn't ask us to scrub their backs.

MEMORANDUM IN RE: PROMOTION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND UNIONIZATION OF FARM WORKERS

Numerous complaints have been received that the Farm Security Administration has been promoting the organization and unionization of farm workers, and even utilizing labor unions to promote a check-off system for union dues in connection with its recruitment and placement of farm labor. According to information received from reliable sources, the Farm Security Administration has utilized the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union or the Migratory Agricultural Workers' Union, or both, in recruiting farm labor for work in Florida. According to these complaints, workers recruited through this union are told that each worker so recruited is required to take out a membership card in the Migratory Agricultural Workers' Union, with an initiation fee of $1 and monthly dues of $1 per month while employed. Members of the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union are not charged initiation fees and are given credit for dues already paid. In this connection, attention is invited to the following documents, consisting of a circular issued by H. L. Mitchell of Memphis, Tenn., explaining this set-up, a mimeographed form apparently duplicated from a United States Employment Service application for farm work, which presumably was prepared for use by this union (please note this identification at the bottom of the form, "MAWU Form"), and a membership application in the Migratory Agricultural Workers' Union.

APPLICATION TO THE U. S. EMPLOYMENT SERVICE FOR FARM WORK

_____, _____
Town State

Please certify for employment as a farm worker
Name_____
Address_____
Race: White_____Negro_____Other_____
Age_____Date Born_____Male_____Female_____
Number in Family_____Ages_____ _____ _____ _____
Kind of work wanted on farm:
1._____ 2._____
3._____ 4._____
State preferred to secure employment:
1._____ 2._____ 3._____
4._____ 5._____ 6._____

_____
Applicant

Date referred to U. S. E. S._____ by_____
Representative

_____
Address

Make out MAWU Form ——

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

I hereby apply for membership in the Migratory Agricultural Workers Union (STFU). If accepted as a member I agree as follows:

1. To obey all rules and regulations in force and hereinafter adopted by the Union.

2. To name the Union as my bargaining agent with employers and as my representative with various agencies of the U. S. Government in wages, hours, working conditions, and other terms of employment.

3. To perform all work found by the Union and accepted by me in a workmanlike manner, giving a day's work for a day's pay.

4. To pay the Union my initiation fee of $1.00 upon acceptance by me of work made available through the Union, and to pay to the Union $1.00 per month dues during each month I am so employed.

Witness my signature this _____ day of _____, 194____.
Sign here _____
Give address_____

Accepted for membership this _____ day of _____, 194____.
MIGRATORY AGRICULTURAL WORKERS UNION,
Name_____
Title_____

Mr. OGG. Mr. Chairman, with respect to suggestions for recruiting and placing farm labor as I stated awhile ago, I think we are pretty much in agreement on fundamentals. There are some details on how to meet these problems that we need to study further.

I would like to comment briefly on one or two things that have come up during the discussion here today.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is this on the record or off the record?

Mr. OGG. This is on the record.

With respect to the manpower problem, it seems to me that this problem is far greater than the scope of the program contemplated in this proposed appropriation. If you give $200,000,000 for that program you are not going to solve the manpower problem entirely. As I say, there are some over-all fundamental manpower and price policies that have got to be corrected immediately, before the planting season, if this food crisis is to be successfully met and a worse crisis averted next fall and winter.

Briefly, there are two fundamentals that it seems to me we must meet if we are going to avert this crisis. First, the workweek for all workers in industry—that is, the average workweek—must be lengthened. When industry as a whole is working only an average of 44 hours a week in all manufacturing industries we are not utilizing to the fullest extent our manpower.

Mr. TARVER. May I just say something there, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. You mean lengthen it with time-and-a-half pay for overtime beyond 40 hours?

Mr. OGG. No. I mean without premium payment for over 40 hours a week.

If we are asking our boys to give their lives and fight at the front under terrible hardships and face the dangers and trials that they are now facing, and since the farmers are working 50 and 60 hours a week and in some cases 70 and 80 hours per week, workers in industry should be willing to work on the average, 54 hours a week without premium pay.

I believe that is the fundamental root of the farmer's labor shortage today. We have had the worst wage inflation in the history of this country.

The reason we have lost so many workers is not because of selective service, but the greatest loss has been to higher-paid industrial jobs. True, we have lost all too many in the past through selective service, workers that could not be spared on the farm, but the facts show that probably two out of every three that have left the farm have gone into the city jobs rather than selective service.

How are you going to correct that? As we see it, the only way you are going to correct that is to give the farmer a sufficient price that will enable him to compete with industry to a sufficient extent to get some of these workers back on the farms—that is, workers and even farm operators who have left the farm.

That does not mean that you have to pay the same wage rate that you pay in an automobile factory.

There are a lot of people who have left the farm who would like to go back to the farm if they got somewhat less than they are now receiving. You would not have to pay them exactly the same as they are getting now. But the farmers cannot pay that competitive wage now with price ceilings on their commodities, which in many cases are in violation of the policies and provisions of the laws which Congress enacted—below the standards set forth in the Price Control Acts and other ceilings are being set or are in prospect which we know will not enable the farmer to pay a competitive wage.

We are trying to persuade the administration to agree to the simple proposition that price ceilings should be adjusted sufficiently to enable the farmer to offset his increased labor cost and pay competitive wages and to get maximum output.

Now, the farmer cannot do that until we get the present policy changed and get the law carried out as we believe Congress intended it to be carried out the mandate in the statute, I believe, the act of October 2, which says that price ceilings on agricultural commodities shall be adjusted sufficiently to insure adequate production of foods for war and to offset farmers' increased costs including farm labor costs.

That policy has not been carried out. That mandate of Congress has been ignored and openly flouted in many of the price ceilings that have been issued.

The farmers are getting so disheartened and so discouraged because of the shortage of labor plus the refusal to give them the means of getting their labor back that they are giving up in despair and going to the cities and taking war jobs.

As I see it, then, there are two fundamental things that should be done: First, lengthen the workweek without premium pay beyond 40 hours. If the wage is unfair, it certainly ought to be adjusted but it doesn't make sense to maintain a "spread-the-work" program when we are short of workers. That will give you a reservoir of manpower to draw on and in itself would relieve the over-all labor shortage. Secondly, give the farmer the assurance that his price ceilings and his price supports are going to be reasonably adjusted to enable him to offset the higher wage costs and get some of his workers back.

THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1943.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

STATEMENT OF ROBERT HANDSCHIN, RESIDENT SECRETARY, LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

The CHAIRMAN. We have before us this item for the farm labor program, in the amount of $65,075,000, in House Document 105:

The committee has before it this morning a representative from the National Farmers Union, Mr. Robert Handschin. What is your affiliation, Mr. Handschin?

Mr. HANDSCHIN. I am the resident secretary of our Washington office.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall be glad to have any statement you care to make on this estimate, which has been submitted to us for the farm labor program, Mr. Handschin.

Mr. HANDSCHIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: I am sorry I was not able to be with you on Monday when a session was held on this matter.

We can well symphathize with the problem of this committee. For about a year now, a large part of our time and a good deal of our thinking has gone into the farm-labor problem that all of us could see ahead.

We have walked our feet off and talked our heads off, and pounded the table in almost every agency in the Government, and we have said a few things up here to Members of Congress, and so far not very much has happened.

This manpower shortage is a very unprecedented situation. You will recall that in World War I we had a temporary, and fairly acute farm labor shortage, primarily in the crop season of 1918. It lasted only one crop season. Emergency measures were taken. Some great interest was shown on the part of farmers, and on the part of the Government to help farmers. But by 1919 that situation had changed measurably and from that time to this day, practically, there has been little or no attention on the part of the Federal Government or, for that matter, on the part of local governments, to the people who are employed as farm laborers on our farms.

I think if you examined the budgets of the Department of Agriculture back through the years—I am not saying it is anyone's fault at all; it is just the situation—you will find hardly a red cent has been appropriated in the course of 50 years for the 25 or 30 percent of our people who earn their living in agriculture by being employed for wages.

There has been a great deal done for farmers themselves, but for the man who started at the foot of the agricultural ladder, as a hired man, very little has ever been done as far as the Government is concerned.

Now we are faced with a labor shortage that is far more acute than anything we ever experienced. We would like, in general, to endorse the type of proposals here made by the Department. We would like to suggest certain changes, and we would like to discuss with the committee two or three matters which I understand are

under consideration by the committee, in making changes in this budget.

In the first place, I think we ought to get one thing straight. There is urgent need for quick action in whatever we do. We are already months late.

We spent some 9 or 10 months securing what finally turned out to be fairly adequate protection from the draft for farmers. We did not secure any way to keep farm workers and farmers from going into industry. It took us 9 or 10 months, however, to meet that particular problem and it meant long, long, long, hours of battling around.

On the question of a program in which the Government would assist in mobilizing farm labor for farmers, in one way or another, we did a little last year in connection with the annual appropriation bill. We had a few emergency measures taken since that time, principally the importation of Mexican workers and the transportation of some American workers, but not nearly enough.

The time is late now and the biggest worry, beyond any doubt, on the part of the farm people who hire labor of whatever kind—and that means possibly about 2,000,000 of our farmers who hire some kind of labor during the year—is, whether or not they can have any assurance of an adequate labor supply at the time they are going to need it.

That has been shown by a number of studies, one of which I understand was made by county agents and was presented to the Bankhead subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. The labor problem was reported by county agents to be the most serious problem of all those facing farmers at this particular time. At least, in the minds of the farmers it was the biggest problem.

In too many cases we have thought in years past of farm labor as if it were simply another commodity for farmers to purchase. We thought about it like we thought of fertilizer, except that you took your fertilizer home, and you put it under cover to keep it out of the rain. Too many times, when we hired a man we did not think very much about keeping him out of the rain.

That has been the case because for 10 years or more we have had farm people being driven off the land by drought, by mechanization of agriculture, by low farm prices, by lack of opportunity to improve their farms. And we therefore have had a very, very large surplus of people available for farm labor. That has been true until the recent past. Therefore we must keep in mind the fact that farmers have become accustomed, during those 10 years, to having a labor supply at hand, not only in adequate amount, but in such an amount that they could be very choosey about whom they hired.

That was not always the case in American agriculture. A generation or two ago, when the frontier was still open, and farm people—those, at least that had the ambition to do so, could move to the frontier and get a farm—farm labor was relatively expensive. And that was one of the reasons why we developed labor-saving machinery for agriculture.

That was particularly true, I may point out in passing, during the Civil War. The loss of young men to the armies on both sides resulted in a very rapid development of labor-saving machinery. If you will examine the figures of production of new machines which had been invented but had not been selling, you will find that between 1860 and 1865, they increased from 5 to 10 times for the different lines.

Can we secure an adequate supply of farm labor for this coming crop season? The total number of people in agriculture is undoubtedly adequate, but they are not where we need them, nor are they sufficiently trained for the work for which we need them.

The other day Senator Byrd pointed out that the British had succeeded in increasing their farm production about 50 percent in time of war, and he listed their manpower policies in connection with agriculture. On British farms today there are almost no men of fighting age, and yet it was possible to secure a very large increase in production.

We have on the farms of this country about 8,000,000 people of adult age, of whom only about three-quarters of a million are year-round, permanent, hired employees. In other words, less than 10 percent—only about 7 or 8 percent—of our year-round labor supply in agriculture are hired employees. However, that figure is misleading because most of our farms are so small, so under-equipped in terms of capital and livestock, buildings, that there is a very high concentration of production on a relatively few farms. Approximately 1,000,000 farms produce about two-thirds of our present commercial production, and virtually all of the three-quarter million year-round permanent employees are employed on those 1,000,000 farms, which means that some of these larger farms have no year-round employee and some have more than one.

I am taking up these sections of the farm-labor problem one by one, because no discussion of farm labor can be undertaken by talking about farm labor as if it were just one problem. It is a different problem with each type of labor and with each commodity and with each area of the country. So that we must discuss them one by one.

We feel that it is possible, as is proposed by the Department of Agriculture, to secure a sufficient number of permanent year-round employees from the ranks of farmers whose farms are of such small capacity that they are not now making any substantial contribution to the war, and in many cases are not even doing any kind of a job of feeding themselves. Already that possibility has been explored by the Department, and a few thousand such workers have been brought from Kentucky and other areas to the north.

We do believe that a family brought up on a farm, even though they may never have had a dairy cow—and there are several hundred thousand farms that do not have a dairy cow on them and cannot afford one apparently—can learn to be efficient and able farm workers on dairy farms.

There certainly is a question of training these people, of getting them interested in moving, and of seeing to it that when they do move, they have some housing available. In times past the hired man in a good many cases was single and lived with the family, but there is not much hope that we are going to have very many single men on the farms for the next year or two. We are going to have to use married men, and we must see to it that there are some facilities in which their families may live.

The suggestion has been made, that at least for this summer, the Army could provide tents, if nothing more. We feel it is possible to provide cheap, demountable housing, and to rent it to a farmer at a very nominal sum. If in the course of time he cared to purchase such a house for use for a hired man, he could do so. Otherwise he could

turn it back to the Government. It should be possible to do that as low as $4 or $5 rent per month.

It is our feeling that the proposal made by the Department of Agriculture in this regard is far too small. To be on the safe side, instead of planning to get 50,000 year-round workers for livestock and dairy farms, we ought to be aiming at not less than 100,000, and we ought to be starting very rapidly now.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean a figure of 100,000?

Mr. HANDSCHIN. 100,000 year-round workers for livestock farms. The figure ought to be doubled.

In agriculture, in the depressed condition it has been in, you have had people attempting, of course, to better their condition. When it was possible, a good many of them left the farm to go to the city. During the thirties, that was not possible much of the time. As soon as it became possible, in 1940, that migration picked up again, and it was not without cause, because after all, the number of opportunities in agriculture are limited. Only about half of our farm boys cannot hope to have a farm of their own. They had to leave the farm, or wait there until they had the opportunity to make a better living than they could on the home place.

If we are going to succeed in getting with the least possible friction workers who will stay in agriculture—and it may be necessary before we are through to use some compulsory measures; in general you have to follow the procedure of graduating people up the economic ladder, The farmers and farm workers, who have gone to industry, went because of what they considered an inadequate income.

In order to replace them, you have to reach down the economic ladder and find someone to whom a job as a year-round employee would be attractive. That is the way we are going to have to meet this problem. It is the way, economically speaking, we met a good part of it in the past without any intervention of Government.

The second part of this program, the provision for year-round migratory workers needed for our fruit and vegetable crops as they mature from the South to the North and back, calls for some 275,000 seasonal workers. Seasonal workers is not a good way to describe such workers. They could be employed almost every day of the year in following those crops. In practice they are employed anywhere from 6 to 10 months of the time. They are really permanent farm workers. That is their business, their trade, their occupation.

It will be impossible to fill this need by the importation of foreign labor. We have four or five main areas needing migratory labor. One is up and down the west coast. Certainly Mexicans are located conveniently to that area and could operate favorably in much of that territory and also in the Rio Grande, if necessary. But on the east coast and up and down the Mississippi Valley, we do not think imported labor can be used very much.

In the border States and in the Southern States and in the cut-over regions of the North there is available a sufficient number of farm families whose standard of living is now so low that if you had any kind of attractive offer to make to them, they would be glad to pick up and go. But you will have to make them some kind of a guaranty.

This part of the bill ought to provide for a voluntary enlistment, 1 year at a time, on the part of a worker and possibly his family; an

enlistment which would provide that he would remain in that occupation. In every group, of course, you will find some who will not prove to be successful workers. We will have to send those people back home if they are not able to be good workers.

We believe this provision ought to be extended to provide a volunteer enlisted land army, and we should recruit more than 275,000. We ought to have the figure up around 400,000, to be on the safe side. We need about 150,000 on the west coast; 100,000 on the east coast; somewhere around 100,000 in the Rio Grande-Texas area: and probably 50,000 or 75,000 up and down the Mississippi Valley.

There has been a good deal of talk about this particular program as it has operated in the last year. There has been a good deal of complaint on the part of some growers, particularly with regard to the provisions of the contract for securing workers. I understand the committee has been discussing that.

Contracts have been necessary, and we think it is quite understandable why they are necessary. The Government has had to go out and say to a family, "Here is an opportunity for you, but you will have to pick up your family, leave your home, dispose of it in some cases, go 1,000 miles or more, stay away many months, maybe permanently, travel from place to place, secure such accommodations as you can secure." The Government has to be able to promise something definite to those people. To do so, it must enter into some kind of a contract with farm employers.

This is not unusual. Most of the labor "padrones," most of your private employment agencies that furnish this type of seasonal labor, have generally had some type of contract. They were not taking people away from their homes. They were not assuming any responsibility for them other than to deliver them to an employer and presumably to furnish workers who would do a good job.

In these contracts there have been two or three chief provisions. There has been a provision for a minimum amount of employment. Three-fourths of the time available has to be guaranteed. A second provision calls for a 30-cent an hour minimum wage. A third provision requires a minimum amount of living space, a 12 by 14 room, for each family, and a safe supply of water.

It has been necessary to insist that employment at least 75 percent of the time be provided. There is not any line of business in America where there was a more wasteful use of labor than in the migratory labor connected with agriculture. There is no more chaotic labor market. It was wasteful, not solely in terms of the labor which they might have done, but it was wasteful also because their annual incomes could never amount to enough to secure for them the decent conditions that would have put and kept them in health. Had they been employed even 5 days a week the year round, their annual incomes would have been rather substantial. Even at a 30-cent an hour rate, it would have been a very substantial figure, simply because the hours on the farm are longer than in industry. They would have made more than some people are making under the minimum wage law, for instance, if there were regular employment.

It has been impossible to furnish such regular employment without having some centralized agency from which workers could be dispatched, from which crops could be scheduled and needs found out;

and from which you could promptly move workers to the next point of need.

I would like to pass on to the third point proposed by the Department, that we find summer workers from among our young people in high schools to the number of at least 200,000, to place on farms that, because of their livestock load and their crops that they have to get in during the summer, need an extra hand. We think this is a highly practical proposal. We think it is one which can do a great deal of good. There ought to be some adequate training for these young people, who are old enough to do two-thirds or three-fourths of a man's job, once they have had a week or two of learning to do some of the simple chores on a farm.

They can learn. You and I all know of boys living in our smaller towns and cities who have done farm work.

The fourth part of budget calls for organizing a lot of volunteers for a week or two weeks assistance at the peak of the season. This proposal, to our mind, is the most difficult one to carry out. It certainly is possible to find three and a half million volunteers and get their names down on paper. But it is another question to see to it that any substantial number of those people get out on the farm when they are needed. It is going to be necessary to do a good deal more planning than was done this past year.

In this budget there is not any mention of a matter which we feel ought to be in it. Forty, fifty years ago, the industries of this country did not like to take the graduates of our State engineering colleges. They thought they were not practical men. Shops and factories and industries were run by rule of thumb. The foreman graduated to be the manager or production superintendent. There was an attitude that scientific training could not be used. That attitude changed.

The same attitude among farmers changed when we found that scientific experimentation was of real benefit to agriculture, at least to those farmers who could take advantage of it.

But industry went ahead and developed a science of labor skills and of organization of the labor force. Scientific studies were made of how to organize your work crew, and of how to organize a particular work operation.

Down through the centuries people had done a job as their fathers showed them, or as they learned from the master. But the division of labor and the introduction of a great many new types of jobs in industry created a condition in which a man was not likely to learn, even if he spent many years at it, the most skilled way to do even a relatively simple job.

So we have developed a definite science of the efficient use of labor, the efficient flow of material through a plant, that has developed time-saving skills, and helped men get the job done the fastest way. That has been carried to a high degree in many industries with a value to both management and labor, apparently, and to the country as a whole.

And yet, little or nothing of the same sort has been done in agriculture. We have figured out how to allocate our efforts to best raise farm income, by means of cost accounting. We know how to level off the labor load and so schedule production on a farm that the farmer would secure a maximum use of his time. We do not do it,

incidentally, on about three or four million of our farms, because they are undercapitalized. They are land hungry and capital hungry. Those farms have an opportunity to increase production if you can give them a livestock load to carry through the year.

We have done a little bit about planning the lay-out of a farm to save unnecessary steps and things of that sort. The farm machinery people have paid some attention to effective ways to use farm machinery. But we have had virtually no attention paid to the simple hand skills in agriculture. And we have had little attention paid to the organization of group work.

I raise all of this, though offhand it may seem like a very trivial matter, because I dare say that the benefits which have accrued to American industry by investigations of this type are no greater than those that could accrue to agriculture, despite the disadvantages in agriculture as compared with industry, such as the lack of possibility for division of labor, and the requirements of the seasons.

So we feel that it would not be improper for this committee now to take recognition of this problem and specifically ask the Department of Agriculture and all of our experiment stations and State colleges to get busy and do this job. Already there are some small starts being made in it, but it needs the utmost encouragement from the Government.

I understand that there has been some discussion of turning all this labor program back to the 48 State extension services. As far as the mobilization of the local labor supply is concerned, I think that is a very sensible proposal. But insofar as labor has to be mobilized and taken over State lines or even carried a long distance in a State, I think we would run into major difficulties. How can we hope to secure proper coordination and some degree of uniform enforcement between the States? There will be a natural hesitancy in any area from which farm people must be drawn into industry or in agriculture, to see them go. And if you set up this program on State lines, you may be well assured that will prevent us from getting our labor supply.

That is all, Mr. Chairman. I should be glad to answer any questions, if there is any member of the committee that wants to ask one at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Handschin.

THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1943.

STATEMENTS OF EDWARD A. O'NEAL, PRESIDENT, AND W. R. OGG, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

RECOMMENDATIONS OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

The CHAIRMAN. We shall be glad to hear Mr. O'Neal at this time.

Mr. EDWARD A. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I would like Mr. Ogg to present our position, and I would like to have the privilege of having the committee hear three directors of extension from three of our greatest States. Then I would like just to introduce, if I may, some of the Farm Bureau leaders who are here, but will not call upon

them to make a statement, unless you gentlemen want to question them.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall be very glad to have you introduce your colleagues, Mr. O'Neal.

Mr. EDWARD A. O'NEAL. There are present with me Mr. Foster, of New York; Mr. Simons; Mr. C. C. Du Mond, of New York; Mr. P. O. Davis, of Alabama; Mr. Frank W. White, of Minnesota; Mr. Earl C. Smith, of Illinois; Mr. Walter Hammond, of Texas; Mr. L. J. Jones, of Mississippi; Mr. R. E. Short, of Arkansas; Mr. George Wilson, of California; and Mr. J. J. Lacy, of Chicago.

Mr. SNYDER. Where is your representative from Pennsylvania?

Mr. EDWARD A. O'NEAL. Unfortunately, Pennsylvania has not a farm bureau; I am sorry.

May I ask Mr. Ogg to present our case.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to hear Mr. Ogg at this time.

Mr. OGG. Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to read this statement of President O'Neal and the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. OGG. Manpower is the Nation's No. 1 problem and the farm labor shortage is our No. 1 manpower problem today. As we have already pointed out repeatedly, there are certain over-all policies which must be immediately modified if the present food crisis is to be relieved and a far worse food crisis next fall and winter is to be avoided.

The workweek in industry should be lengthened to 54 hours a week without premium pay for overtime in excess of 40 hours. By this one stroke we could greatly expand our output of war materials and release large numbers of workers to supply the shortages of labor on the farm and elsewhere.

Farmers and farm workers now needed on the farms should be deferred from military service, and former farmers and farm workers who have been inducted into military service who are still in this country and who are needed on farms should be furloughed for farm work, provided they consent to do so.

Most of the people who have left the farm, however, have gone into higher-paid industrial jobs. In order to induce some of these skilled, experienced farmers and farm workers to return to the farm, price ceilings and price supports for farm products should be so adjusted to enable farmers to compete for this labor and to offset their increased labor costs.

Finally, we must have a practical, workable plan for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor which will provide sufficient labor to farmers when they need it—free from impractical, bureaucratic restrictions which hinder rather than help farmers and farm workers in achieving maximum production for the war.

Up to now, we have not had such a program.

The farm-labor program has been badly bungled and all too often farmers have been harassed and hindered instead of helped in securing increased production. Considerable quantities of food have already been lost because of the failure to provide a satisfactory, workable program of recruiting and placing farm labor to meet the requirements of farmers.

The program submitted to Congress by the Department of Agriculture through the Bureau of the Budget, calling for a blanket appropriation of $65,050,000 to the Secretary of Agriculture, in our judgment, is unsound and inadequate to do the tremendous job confronting American agriculture in this critical hour.

It will result in divided authority and responsibility, confusion, and overlapping of activities. It will result in setting up another bureaucracy in the Department at Washington, with new offices in the field and a program under centralized control from Washington.

It will require more manpower and excessive costs of administration and operation because of this duplication and because of the creation of another agency with field personnel.

Most serious of all, the time is now too late to set up another new agency and create the new machinery in the field and work out all the relationships with all the other agencies involved in time to get the job done.

Under the proposed program submitted by the Department of Agriculture, we understand that out of the total of $65,050,000, approximately $6,000,000 would be allocated to the Agricultural Extension Service for the mobilization of 3 to 3½ million local workers, including nonfarm youth and women, and that practically all of the remaining funds would probably be turned over to the Farm Security Administration to recruit, transport, and place approximately 350,000 seasonal workers and approximately 42,000 year-around workers, and to develop, construct, and operate 250 new farm labor camps and shelters. Thus, the Extension Service is expected to recruit and place 90 percent of the workers with 10 percent of the money, while the Farm Security Administration is to get 10 percent of the workers and expend about 90 percent of the money.

Approximately 1¼ million dollars which would be available for administrative expenses of the Farm Labor Unit in the United States Department of Agriculture. The unit was formerly located in the Food Production Administration and was in charge of Major John O. Walker. On March 1, 1943, Secretary Wickard replaced this unit with another agency to be called the Agricultural Labor Administration, and gave it the following authority, according to the official announcement issued on that date:

> It will take over the farm labor work previously carried on by the Agricultural Labor Branch of the Food Production Administration and will also integrate farm labor work done by other Department agencies, including that of the Food Distribution Administration, the Farm Security Administration, and the Extension Service.

Mr. Wayne H. Darrow, of the Department of Agriculture's Information Office has been placed in charge of this new bureau.

Thus, under this program there will be at least two agencies in the field, recruiting, transporting, and placing farm labor in the States and in the counties—the Farm Security Administration and the Agricultural Extension Service. In addition, it is understood that the new Agricultural Labor Administration will establish regional offices and possible State offices in every State to control and direct this program. This will inevitably result in duplication of offices and facilities and supervisory staffs in the States and counties, with all the possibilities of conflicts and confusion that arise under such conditions.

Furthermore, the United States Employment Service is to maintain its Nation-wide staff and will continue to recruit workers for the farm whenever they cannot be secured by the Extension Service or the Farm Security Administration. This will add still further to the confusion of divided responsibility and activities.

In addition, it is apparently intended to inject the agricultural war boards into the picture, which will add another agency to deal with farm labor problems. I am afraid this will result in confusion worse confounded out of confusion of duplicating, overlapping agencies and activities in the States and counties that will ensue. I quote the following statement from a memorandum of instructions from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Director of the Extension Service, M. L. Wilson, dated February 17, 1943:

> At the county and State levels the representatives of Extension Service, the Farm Security Administration, and the Agricultural Adjustment Agency will carry out the responsibilities assigned them in the farm labor program, and the county and State United States Department of Agriculture War Boards will be responsible for coordinating this work of the agencies.

I might add that I overlooked one other agency. I note the Agricultural Adjustment Agency is also to have some responsibilities in connection with farm labor.

Continuing the quotation:

> A directive outlining the overall aspects and responsibilities of this program will be issued to United States Department of Agriculture War Boards shortly, and Extension members will receive this directive by virtue of their membership on War Boards.

Gentlemen, it is imperative that Congress provide for the establishment of a practical, workable plan which will avoid duplication and overlapping, divided responsibility, and which will get the maximum results in the shortest possible time, with the minimum of expense.

Time is precious. There is not a minute to lose. We dare not wait to set up a new administrative machine reaching down into every State and county to plan and carry out a farm-labor program on a Nation-wide scale, and attempt to run it from Washington. If this job is to be done effectively and if it is not to be "to little and too late," it should be obvious that we must use the agencies we have got that are capable of doing the job.

We therefore recommend:

(1) That the entire responsibility for recruiting, transporting, and placing farm labor be placed in one agency, the Extension Service, which already has established an experienced, trained organization with a successful record of operation and accomplishment since 1914, and which enjoys the confidence of farmers in every State. This agency already has an office in the United States Department of Agriculture, and an efficient organization in every State and in every agricultural county, with working relationships between the Washington office and the State organizations already established by law and by cooperative agreements. It could get in action on a Nation-wide scale overnight if it were given this responsibility.

(2) That all of the funds should be appropriated to the Office of Extension Service in the United States Department of Agriculture, to be expended under its supervision and direction in cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges

in the respective States on the basis of existing agreements between the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, and be apportioned to the States on the basis of need. Provision should be made which will permit the States to supplement the funds apportioned to the State extension service from this appropriation wherever the States desire to do so.

(3) That this program be decentralized to the fullest extent possible so that each State can develop a program best adapted to meet the conditions and needs in their respective States and so that the program will not bog down through attempts to run it all from Washington. Most of the job has got to be done in the States.

(4) That, in order to avoid divided responsibility and duplication of activities, the Extension Service in each State be placed in full charge of all farm-labor recruiting, transporting, and placement within their respective States, and shall be authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States Extension Service and/or other agencies.

(5) That, with respect to migrant labor moving across State lines and imported labor, the Office of Extension Service in the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the extension services in the States that are affected, be authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such labor to and from the States in which it is to be employed; and that such State extension services as are concerned in obtaining such labor be authorized individually or collectively to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service for recruiting and transporting such labor to and from such States, subject to general rules and regulations to be approved by the respective Federal offices. Whenever such agreements are entered into, the Federal Office of Extension Service should be authorized to transfer such funds as may be required to the United States Employment Service to carry out such agreements.

(6) That a prohibition be written into this appropriation by Congress which will prohibit the use directly or indirectly of any of these funds or any other funds hitherto made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transporting, and placement of farm labor, to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of section 3 (f), 7 (c), and 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. Proper and reasonable steps can be and should be taken on a sensible, workable basis to assure adequate housing and sanitary conditions and a reasonable period of time should be provided in which to renegotiate the agreement between the Governments of Mexico and the United States so as to remove its objectionable, impracticable and unnecessary specifications, pending which time, it will be necessary to provide sufficient funds to the Farm Security Administration for the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico during this period.

(7) Congress should specifically exclude the Farm Security Administration from any further responsibility or activity with respect

to the recruitment, transportation, housing, subsistence, or placement of farm workers.

If this program is adopted, it will get rid of dividend responsibility, duplication of agencies and activities and the inevitable confusion resulting therefrom. It will make it unnecessary to provide any new agency in the Department of Agriculture or in the field.

It will confer the full responsibility upon one agency, the Extension Service in the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the extension service in the States but will authorize the use, through agreements, of the United States Employment Service which already has a going organization to recruit and transport migrant labor or imported labor.

Under this set-up, this program could be put into action overnight. The Extension Service and the Employment Service already have Nation-wide organizations established with experienced, trained personnel and contacts already established between their Federal and local agencies.

This is the quickest method of getting a Nation-wide program into action with the maximum results. It will be the most economical method of administration as there will be no need to set up a new special administrative organization in the Department of Agriculture with regional and State offices or county offices. Under the Department's proposal, we understand that approximately 1½ million dollars is proposed for administrative expenses of the new Agricultural Labor Administration, plus about 3 million dollars for administrative expenses of the Farm Security Administration for recruiting and placing migrant workers plus another 3 or 4 million dollars for operating additional camps and shelters. Practically all of this administrative cost would be saved under our recommendations. A modest amount for additional administrative personnel would be adequate, because existing organizations would be utilized.

A final and extremely important reason why the plan we have recommended is preferable to the Department's plan, is that farmers have full confidence in the Extension Service. They are accustomed to going to the county agent's office for help with all their farm problems. Morale and confidence of farmers in the administration of the farm labor program is extremely important because of the bungling and impractical manner in which the program has been handled up to now. Farmers will not have confidence in a program that is centralized in Washington. Neither do they want to see another bureaucracy established in the Department of Agriculture.

Again, I wish to emphasize that time is urgent. It is now March 4. We cannot afford to risk any further experimentation or wait until a new administrative machine can be built up. If this job is to be done in time to help farmers get their planting operations carried out on a maximum scale, it is obvious that we must use an agency already available and that is ready to act at once in a manner that will secure the maximum cooperation of farmers.

We believe that the plan we have recommended will accomplish that result in the maximum results. While the Extension Service or any other agency probably realizes the extreme difficulty of this task, I am sure that it will respond patriotically to the call of its country in this hour of national crisis and accept this grave responsibility, if Congress asks it to undertake this job.

I hope that Congress will give its approval to these recommendations and that action will be taken at the earliest possible date.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Ogg, I want to ask you one question. It seems to me that you have some very admirable suggestions. But as against the Budget estimate of $65,000,000 that is before us, what would be your judgment as to the total amount that should be appropriated in order to effectuate your recommendations?

Mr. OGG. Congressman Ludlow, I am not authorized to give you a definite recommendation on behalf of the Farm Bureau as to the amount of money that would be required. But I have given this some little study myself, and personally—although I would not want this to be construed as a recommendation of our organization—personally I am convinced that this program, if it were handled on the basis that the Farm Bureau has recommended, could be handled with greater results at far less expense than $65,000,000.

I might give you, perhaps, some information which might be helpful to you gentlemen in arriving at what would be a necessary amount.

Taking the figures as I understand the Department has submitted them to this committee, in which they are proposing to recruit about 350,000 seasonal workers, who will be moved from one State to another, and allowing an average of $50 apiece as the cost of transporting those workers, it would require $17,500,000 for that purpose.

I might point out that that $50 would be sufficient to move workers 600 miles each way, a total round trip of 1,200 miles at 2 cents a mile. That would be $24 for railroad fare, leaving $26 for meals and subsistence and any other emergency expense, and some leeway within your $50.

Some of them might have families, whose expense of moving might have to be taken care of. But in that group there would seem to be little need to move families except in the case of Mexican workers. It will be necessary in some cases to move their families.

There is some leeway there to do that, in that $50. It would appear to be a fairly reasonable figure for an over-all average when you are moving migrant workers to work a few weeks or a few months.

Then I understand that they are proposing to recruit and place about 42,000 year-round workers, who probably would move from one State to another. Let us assume that most of those have families and that it would cost, we will say, an average of $100 apiece. Not all of them will have families, so there is some leeway there. That would run you $4,200,000.

Now, as to the temporary housing facilities, including rental and operation of buildings or camps or existing facilities, if you allowed a total of $10,000,000, that would total $31,700,000.

Then for the program set up for the recruiting and training and placement in the States, I believe there is about $6,000,000 set aside for that. That would make the total of $37,700,000 or a saving of nearly $30,000,000 below what is requested in the appropriation.

As I say, I do not know whether this is the right amount or not. But in attempting to arrive at somewhat of an appraisal of what would be required if you cut out all of the duplication and overhead and administrative expense that would be eliminated if you use the Extension Service and the Employment Service which are already set up to go, it would seem to me personally that that would not be

far out of the way, if it is possible to recruit as many migrant workers as proposed in the Department's plan.

But I would want to say this further, that I think I would like to have the committee in making the appropriation make it on a temporary basis for a period to get through the rest of this year with the understanding that, if this is not adequate, a request for further funds could be made. As I understand, this is a deficiency appropriation anyway and would not be expected to run through the whole next fiscal year.

Mr. SNYDER. Do I understand that all three of the farm organizations who had representatives in here the other day have endorsed the program that you are presenting here this morning?

Mr. OGG. Mr. Goss is here representing the Grange. I do not know whether any of the other representatives are here or not.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to have that question answered.

Mr. OGG. They can speak for themselves.

But it is my understanding that we agreed on most of the fundamental phases of this program. There may be some difference as to the details of how to set up the program here in Washington. There may be a difference as to that. I would prefer to have them speak for themselves. I am not sure just to what extent that is so. We indicated to you the other day that there was some slight difference, that we felt that we were in agreement on the fundamental principles involved pretty well, but we had not at that time had time to iron out the details.

Mr. SNYDER. Do you think that you can sit down within 3 days if you get this and work out these principles and go to work on it, these three organizations, in a 100-percent spirit to carry it out?

Mr. OGG. We have sought to do that in the time that we have had. We have had a number of meetings. Our own Board of Directors has been here in session for 3 days. The time available has been very limited. We did our best to comply with your request, but we were not able to reach a complete agreement on every detail.

So we thought it best under those circumstances for each organization to come here and present to you our recommendations as organizations.

I do not believe that you will find that we are very far apart on most of the fundamentals. But we, because of varying resolutions and the policies which each organization has established, felt that it was preferable that each present his own statement.

Mr. O'NEAL. You made several recommendations. Do you believe that the success of the program which you are recommending depends upon the adoption of every one of those recommendations? For instance, do you feel that the success of the program depends upon adopting the law with respect to the 54 hours of employment weekly in industry?

Mr. OGG. No, sir; That was not intended. That was included in this statement for the purpose of pointing out that this immediate request for recruiting and placing farm labor is not adequate in itself to meet the entire problem. We do not think that you should expect that, just because you gentlemen appropriate money for this purpose, that is going to solve the whole manpower problem.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is the point I am making. You feel, then, that until that is done a part of the problem will not be solved? Is that right?

Mr. OGG. Not completely. We feel——

Mr. O'NEAL. How adequately do you think that the problem will be solved under your recommendations provided there is nothing done, say, on the 54-hour week—which is it that you recommended?

Mr. OGG. May I answer you in this way: I feel that this program will get the fullest results that we could hope to obtain——

Mr. O'NEAL. But this is a futile gesture without getting this 54 hours a week adopted?

Mr. OGG. No. Do not misunderstand me. It is absolutely vital and imperative that a practical, workable plan for recruiting and placing farm labor be put into operation at the earliest possible moment, regardless of whether you have a 54-hour week or not, because the farmers have got the job of producing food and we have got to do the job no matter what is done with the 54 hours a week, if we can. This is just to help the farmers to get the labor to get this job done. It would help us a lot more if you lengthened the workweek, because we would have more workers to recruit.

Mr. O'NEAL. What is your feeling as to the success of the program unless that is done?

Mr. OGG. I think it will be necessary without that change in the policy. I think it is all the more necessary to have a recruitment program if you do not repeal——

Mr. O'NEAL. Then it is not mandatory to have it?

Mr. OGG. If you have a 54-hour workweek, you will have a larger reservoir of workers, and the farmers will not need as much help to recruit labor as if you do not have it.

Mr. O'NEAL. Do you think that the job can be done without that, or must that be done before the job can be accomplished?

Mr. OGG. I think, Congressman, it would be almost fatal to wait on this until the 54-hour week is acted on, because that is so controversial, much as we want to see it done.

The planting season is right on hand. They are already beginning to plant in some areas. Every day that is lost is precious. I do not see how we could afford or dare to wait on the settlement of the 54-hour workweek to do this. This is an emergency program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Was the 54-hour workweek program that you suggested applicable to the farmers only or did you have in mind industry also?

Mr. OGG. We do not need to suggest it for the farmer. He is already working 60 or 70 and in many cases 80 hours a week. It is for industry. We are urging this for industrial workers. There is no limit to the farm workweek.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree that there is no limit to the hours per week put in by the farmer. All of us know that. Now it occurs to me that the representatives of the various farm organizations of the country might well get together on a general program to improve the present bottleneck in farm production. I think all the members of the committee understand that this is a real emergency; but there seems to be considerable differences of opinion as to the remedy.

Judging, however, from your testimony there appears to be no sure remedy. Apparently, it is too late now to formulate a program

for 1943 that will guarantee an increase in production. It is like closing the barn door after the horse has gone; so, regardless of any action taken by this committee, it is going to be impossible to produce more foodstuffs in 1943 than we produced in 1942, although the Secretary of Agriculture has called on farmers to produce substantially more in 1943 than they were able to produce in 1942.

Mr. OGG. I think that that is true, Congressman, that the hour is now so late that things should have been done months ago that have not been done; that it is going to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get as much food produced as we could have done if those things had been done.

But I would not want to say that it is too late to do anything. I think that the very fact that we have failed months ago, and the fact that we are going to have to have more food this year than we had last year despite the tremendous difficulties, makes it all the more essential that we not leave a stone unturned to enable farmers to get this job done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have been interested in listening to your testimony to hear you say something about prices of farm products. Do you think that the present price level of all farm products is such that farmers are going to be able to pay, say $3 a day as proposed by the Department of Agriculture, for Mexican workers or other transit farm workers, to chop their cotton, plough their corn, or do any other work that has to be done on the farm?

Mr. OGG. Congressman Johnson, as I stated here the other day, and I would like to repeat it, in our judgment there must be an immediate right about face of our price control policy and our price support policy so as to carry out the policies which Congress has already enacted, namely, to adjust the price ceilings adequately to offset the farmer's increased labor cost and enable him to bid up and compete to a reasonable extent in getting back some of the labor that he has lost and to offset his higher labor costs and enable him to get maximum production.

We have been pleading for months to get that done, and we hope you gentlemen can get it done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Do you have any recommendations to make with reference to the so-called Bankhead farm bill that passed the Senate the other day? Are you interested in that program?

Mr. OGG. I stated—I think you perhaps came in after I started my statement—in my prepared statement I said that we favored action to defer all needed workers who are now on the farms, that is, farm workers who are on the farms, and to furlough from the armed services former farmers or farm workers who are needed on the farms, who are now still in this country, provided it meets with the approval of the individual soldier.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree that farmers could get some relief during crop planting and harvesting time if arrangements could be made to have the farm boys or even a large portion of them who are in the armed forces furloughed for that purpose. We must bear in mind, however, that it takes a lot of red tape under the present regulations to get that done. What is your position with reference to these proposed furloughs?

Mr. OGG. Our position, as I understand it, would be to have him furloughed subject to his consent. We would not favor forcing those

men to get out of the armed services and be drafted back on the farm against their wishes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Ogg, several Members of Congress and at least one member of this committee have urged that farm boys who have gone into the various war industries be immediately brought back to the farms of the country. That possibility may seem reasonable to some, but when we take into consideration that these former farm boys are now receiving extravagant wages in industry—do you or your organization advocate attempting to take them out of industry and return them to the farm?

Mr. OGG. Congressman, that question is tied up with the whole question of compulsory draft of all labor.

Our recommendation at this time on that is that if you adjust the price ceiling policy and the price support policy, the farmers will bid up enough to get some of this labor back.

We believe that there are a good many workers who left the farms and who have gone to the cities to take jobs who, even though they had to take a little less than they are now getting, would go back to the farms. But the farmer has got to have an adjustment of his ceiling which will enable him to bid up and pay those wages.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Now, with reference to your suggestion that the Extension Service handle this entire job, do you believe that the Service in the various States has sufficient personnel or could get sufficient trained personnel to handle this difficult problem, including the transplanting of transient workers from one part of the country to the other?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir. I am confident that they could if this appropriation is provided as we have recommended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If I remember the record correctly some of the witnesses, including the head of the Extension Service, Mr. Wilson, testified that the Extension Service is in position to handle the matter satisfactorily in the respective states; but that as to matters affecting intrastate farm labor problems, that it would be more practical and less complicated to place that phase of the program directly under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. OGG. Our recommendation is that the responsibility be centered in the office of the Extension Service in the Department of Agriculture and the Extension Service of the land-grant colleges in the States, and that the office of Extension Service in cooperation with the State services, or that the State services in collaboration with other States may enter into an agreement, a cooperative agreement, with the U. S. Employment Service to recruit and transport migrant labor across State lines or Mexican labor that adequate and sufficient funds be allocated to carry out those agreements. But the important thing there is that the policy and responsibility would be centralized in one agency.

There is another reason which was not brought out in our statement. Unless that is done, we fear that the War Manpower Commission, which has reserved to itself under the war powers the authority to determine all the policies and the standards of recruitment and placing of farm labor, might inject some more unworkable restrictions, such as they have already done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. When you appeared before this committee a few days ago I believe I called your attention to a proposed

contract to be signed between the farm owner or the tenant farmer and the employee. Have you read that contract?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; I filed a copy of it here following my testimony the other day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Have you any suggestion with reference to any changes or eliminations of some of the impossible requirements in that proposed contract?

Mr. OGG. Our recommendation is that this contract be eliminated. Such an impractical requirement of farmers in connection with any recruiting and placing of farm labor has already resulted in a serious loss of food. We think it is absolutely impractical to carry out that kind of arrangement.

Moreover, it is contrary, as we see it, to the policies laid down by the Congress, which specifically exempted agricultural labor from such regulations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That contract, although somewhat complicated, was apparently prepared for the protection only of the farm worker and not for the tenant farmer or the farm owner. I assume the Department feels that it is going to be difficult to get farm labor to go from one section of the country into another section or another State unless there is a minimum wage guaranteed to the workers.

Mr. OGG. I think that that is a very simple matter, Congressman. If you have an agency in which farmers and farm workers have confidence, with an office in every county, it is a very simple matter to handle the matter. The farmer would go to the county agent's office and place his order for so many workers and would state when they would be needed and how long they would be needed and what he is willing to pay. Proper investigation could also be made very easily to determine whether adequate housing facilities are available. Then armed with this information, it would be a simple matter to inform workers of the conditions of employment and what they are going to get. Certainly, if the farmer takes advantage of the worker, all he has got to do is to step across to another farm, or to another county, where he can easily get better wages and conditions, because the farmers are bidding against each other for this labor.

In Florida during the harvest season for winter vegetables this year they were paying labor as high as $10 or $12 a day to save these crops. Farmers were standing on the street corners in the morning competing with one another to get the short supply of labor.

With a shortage of labor such as we have now you do not need to have minimum wage restrictions. It is going to be the other way around. Wages are already spiraling so high that the farmers cannot afford to pay the wages.

Certainly every reasonable assurance is afforded, especially when you have the authority to pay transportation and subsistence and housing en route by the Government to move workers from place to place with no expense to the workers. There is no trouble at all to move those workers somewhere else if the farmers do not give them a square deal.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. My reaction as a farmer to this is this: It appeals to me that we have to do something about it because there is going to be some program. Do you not think that it will be all washed up unless we get this 54-hour workweek without overtime pay and fur-

lough these boys from the Army? Do you not think that any other program is not worth the money really?

Mr. OGG. No; I do not believe that I can agree with that.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Where are you going to get the farm workers? If you spend a hundred million dollars for a set-up, where are you going to get the workers if you are not going to get them out of the farms? There are these boys in this country, farm boys, who have spent a year or so at the camps. You are not going to get transients. You are not going to induce people to go out there even if you have a hundred-million dollar set-up to do it.

Mr. OGG. I agree that is going to be difficult to very many transient workers now.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Fifty percent of them will be failures. Farm work is hard work, in the hot sun in the summer. Those people do not know how to do it. They are thinking about going there, but the farmers do not want them. They are in the way.

I think that any program is futile unless you have a 54-hour week without overtime and unless you have some way to get them back or furlough them back from the Army.

Mr. OGG. I will agree with you to this extent: That you are not going to get many workers to cross State lines this year, because they are going to be short everywhere in this country and you are going to get them mostly right in the States.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Take Kansas City. There is an area of 100 miles around Kansas City. That is a practical situation. There may be another small community with an area of 50 miles range around it. You have got to get those people out by inducing them from a patriotic spirit to go out and do this work. You cannot do it by persuading them to work.

Mr. OGG. But it does need some agency, Congressman, to correlate it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I do not think it needs anything.

Mr. OGG. Somebody has to see that the workers get there when they are needed, and where they are needed, and in the quantity that is needed.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It is all a social problem. You can leave out the wage scales and standards of living and all of that. We do not need any of them. All we need to do is to let them go home on a furlough. They will be glad to go home and help.

Mr. OGG. I do not think you need a great deal of money if you turn it over to this agency, the Extension Service. It can do it at a comparatively small expense.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Ogg, I have been very much interested in your statement. I think you have some very excellent ideas.

There is one thing that I want to ask you about, and that is the degree of responsibility that you propose to place on the United States Employment Service in the employing of these men in States and transporting them to other States.

I have been troubled by the campaign which has been carried on for several years or for a long period of time, of undertaking to relocate the agricultural population of this country. The Bureau of Agriculture people want to substitute their judgment of where farm families ought to live for the judgment which has been exercised by them and by their ancestors as to where they should live.

The Employment Service, or the men utilizing the Employment Service offices, have recently, in my district, sent out men from the employment offices and they have been calling in the tenants and the landlords in the area and advising them to go to Florida to accept employment. And when the tenant advised these officials that they had contracted with Mr. So-and-So for the year 1943 and did not desire to remove to Florida, they were, according to advices that I have received, in which I have the utmost confidence, told that unless they went to Florida, they would be drafted into the Army.

Now, in a plan such as this, which contemplates the transportation of workers, I want to know what assurance there is going to be that there is not going to be some abuse of authority as has been carried on.

It seems to me that county committees in the different counties should be vested with some supervisory power. In other words, if a county committee would decide that there is not enough farm labor in the county to meet the needs of the farmers in that country, the Employment Service ought not to be permitted, and nobody ought to be permitted, to go in there and try to take away the tenants and sharecroppers and hired hands from the farmers in that country and transport them to other areas of the country.

It seems to me that your plan, involving the interstate transportation of workers, would not be sound unless there is some such restriction as that indicated. I want to know what your reaction would be to that suggestion.

Mr. GEE. I think you raised a very important point there, Congressman Tarver.

We have many complaints ourselves of the activities of the Employment Service in some States. In other States it has been handled very well. We have had a number of complaints in the South recently about representatives from the Employment Service, and more recently, the Farm Security Administration, going away over even as far as Arkansas and Mississippi and taking labor which those farmers needed there and trying to get that labor and send them to Florida.

That is why we recommended that the sole responsibility and all of the funds for recruiting and transportating any farm labor be vested in one agency, the Extention Service in the Department in collaboration with the extension services in the States, as a joint responsibility; and that they would only enter into cooperative agreements with the Employment Service to handle such migrant labor from State to State as is needed in the judgment of the Extension Service. And, of course, when they are in charge of the program and when they control the money, it was our feeling that that would be an adequate safeguard; that they could lay down proper standards by which cooperative agreements should be carried out.

Mr. TARVER. Why should not the county committees have the privilege of veto in connection with a campaign in any county to recruit labor? If the county committee in any county, which is elected by the farmers of the county, say, "We need all the farm labor that we have here. We do not have any to send to other States or other sections of the country" why should there be a campaign of recruitment carried on in that county for labor to be used outside of the county at all?

Mr. Ogg. I believe that the reason for your suggestion perhaps is your fear that they will recruit people out of the county when they are all needed there. I cannot think that would be done under our plan. The average county agent knows pretty well the conditions in his county. We feel that that is an adequate safeguard.

Mr. Tarver. The county agent under your plan would not have the power of veto. The other authorities higher up would have the right to interfere in that county with the program, although the farmers in that county feel that they need all the farm labor available in that county.

What would be the harm of requiring that the consent of the county committee, who are made up of farmers and elected by farmers, be obtained before any such recruitment of such workers could be done in that county?

Mr. Ogg. I think there is one objection, Congressman. This is such an emergency program and speed is the essence that it would require the clearing with another agency and it would get another agency involved, which would complicate the operation of it.

Mr. Tarver. It would not take long to get instructions from the county committee. It would not require any great length of time.

Mr. Ogg. Of course you understand that under our recommendations we hope that you would write into the appropriation itself a specification that the agricultural extension service in the States is to be in complete charge of all recruitment and placement of all workers within that State, including migratory workers in or to be——

Mr. Tarver. But they would be subject to control from Washington, to instruct them to carry out a recruitment campaign in that State, for workers to be sent to California or some other far-away section of the country. They would not have the authority. There is always the possibility, or probability, that in carrying out their program they would not be carrying out a war need, but somebody's idea as to relocating the agricultural population of the country.

This question was brought up by a representative of the Farmers Union, and it was definitely stated several years ago by Mr. Wallace when he was Secretary of Agriculture that he wanted to move 2,000,000 farm families out of the South. They would be moving the people, not in pursuance of any war objective, but trying to relocate the agricultural population. And that is something that I certainly think ought to be guarded against.

Mr. Ogg. Could I say this: That I would like to make clear that we also recommended that the program be decentralized and not run by the Office of Extension here; that they only have the general supervisory charge, but that practically all of the money would be apportioned out to the States and they would hire their own employees and run their own program in the States and in the counties. So I believe that that would make them pretty independent.

Mr. Tarver. I do not believe that a provision of this kind ought to be adopted unless we can make sure that any recruiting of farm workers is going to be carried on in the county.

Mr. Ogg. We would favor that principle of decentralization.

Mr. Dirksen. Apparently the language of the appropriation bill would permit each county to handle it.

Mr. OGG. Each county and each State would control their own policy under proper rules and regulations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The matter would be so handled and the State program so arranged that you would serve each State with the available workers therein.

Mr. OGG. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do you know in how many counties of the country we have county agents now?

Mr. OGG. There are a little over 3,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have an extension State office in every State in the Union?

Mr. OGG. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Ogg.

(Mr. Ogg subsequently requested that the following memorandum be inserted in the record to show the position taken by the land-grant colleges:)

MEMORANDUM OF ACTION TAKEN BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, MARCH 5 AND 6, 1943

The executive committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities at their meeting on March 5 and 6, 1943, discussed at length the problem of securing a farm labor supply to assist the food production program for 1943. The executive committee also studied and discussed the various proposals of the Secretary of Agriculture, the farm organization and the Congress for meeting this acute farm labor shortage. The committee believes that a feasible, workable plan should be adopted at the earliest possible date as crops are already being planted in many States and any program developed at this late date will barely be able to meet the needs in even the northern dairy and Corn Belt States.

The land-grant colleges through their agricultural extension services do not seek responsibility for supervising the farm labor program but if it is the will of Congress, the Extension Service should undertake such a program; then the executive committee in view of the emergency pledges the full cooperation of the land-grant colleges through the Extension Service and providing adequate appropriations are made to implement this program will accept responsibility for:

1. Mobilizing and placing all available labor within the county, including experienced farm labor, high-school students in cooperation with the schools, volunteer businessmen, women and others.

2. Transporting, housing, placing, and supervising migratory labor within the State in cooperation with the United States Employment Service or other agency designated by Congress.

3. Cooperating with the United States Employment Service or other agency designated by Congress in placing, housing, and supervising migratory labor from without the State who will be recruited and transported by the designated agency.

Federal appropriations made to the Extension Service for this program should be allotted to the States without necessity of offset.

The above statement was approved by the executive committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in regular meeting on March 5 and 6, 1943, in Washington, D. C.

T. O. WALTON,
Chairman of Executive Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is the next witness?

Mr. EDWARD A. O'NEAL. Mr. Simons, the director of the extension service of New York.

Mr. WOODRUM. I would like to know one thing. We have heard from the Farm Bureau. I was wondering if we ought not to hear someone from the National Grange. The time is getting rather short.

If we are not going to get a chance to hear all of these gentlemen, we ought to hear someone from the Grange. I would like to hear someone.

The CHAIRMAN. We expect to hear all of them. I hope that you gentlemen will remain.

Mr. WOODRUM. I think that we ought to give the Grange a chance to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. We will hear everybody.

Mr. EDWARD A. O'NEAL. I think, Mr. Chairman, since you are going to ask the land-grant colleges to handle this, you certainly ought to hear the director of the extension service who handles this for the millions of farmers in the great State of New York. That is the reason that we ask Mr. Simons to be the next witness.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

STATEMENT OF L. R. S. SIMONS, DIRECTOR, EXTENSION SERVICE, NEW YORK STATE

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Simons, we would be glad to have a statement from you.

Mr. SIMONS. I have no prepared statement, but I would like to make a few observations based on the work that we have already done in New York State.

First of all, I am convinced that there is no uniform pattern that will fit all of the States. Conditions are not the same in the States, and the organizations are not the same. Therefore, the recommendation that has been made by the farm organizations to largely decentralize the program in the States seems to me to be a logical move.

As an illustration, in our own State we started in July 1940 on this farm-labor program before the rest of the country seemed to realize that there was going to be a problem. It was started through the farm organizations of the State in setting up what is known as the New York State agricultural defense committee.

That committee is made up of representatives of the Grange, the Farm Bureau, the Home Bureau, the 4-H Club, the G. L. S. Exchange, the Dairymen's League, Vegetable Growers, Horticultural Society, State Poultry Council, Farmer Chairman of the A. A. A., the Farmer Chairman of the Advisory Committee of the Farm Credit Administration, the Farmer Chairman of the Soil Conservation set-up, the farmer representative of the Farm Credit Administration, and the farmer representative of the Land Group Planning Committee. This committee is made up entirely of farmers or farm women.

This committee has since been made a part of the State war council. It is the agricultural committee of the State war council, and reports to the war council.

A similar organization exists in every county of the State, although in some counties all of these organizations do not exist. Therefore the membership is made up of the farmer heads of each organization that is there.

This committee has a technical committee made up of representatives of the agencies which are dealing with farm labor. That includes the Extension Service, the schools, the Farm Security Administration, the A. A. A., and the Employment Service.

This technical committee meets often to prepare plans for consideration of the agricultural defense committee, which determines the policies.

Under this arrangement we have had a division of responsibility and a uniform plan without any dissension whatever as between these organizations.

The point that I want to make is that the farmers are in control of the program, which is as it should be, I believe. We help them prepare their plans and carry out their objectives.

That would be the way we would carry on this program if the authority were sent to the extension service of the State. We would continue on this same plan.

In fact, we are already doing it through funds that have been appropriated by the State legislature to the war council through the active cooperation of the Employment Service, which is now at work placing a man in each agricultural county.

This man is selected by the county agent. He is paid by the Employment Service. He is located in either the employment office or the county agent's office, depending on which is best.

However, their funds will not last very long, as I understand it; and it will have to be financed in some other way. However, the arrangement will continue as it is. We will use the same personnel.

I think you can see from what I have told you that in our State at least we are prepared to carry on a well-coordinated program, as we have in the past, without any addition of anyone from the organizations, either the farm organization or the other agencies. And I believe the same situation should be developed, and maybe perhaps is developed, in other States.

Mr. TABER. I wish you would tell us if you are in position to go on and carry out the recruitment of farm labor as well as you believe it can be done there; and, if so, something about what it would cost in that territory.

Mr. SIMONS. In our State?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SIMONS. I gave an estimate to the State war council of $154,000 for local recruitment and placement within the State until January 1.

Mr. TABER. Will you tell us whether or not you are in a position to go out and do what needs to be done there and produce as good results as can be had with that amount?

Mr. SIMONS. That does not cover, of course, Congressman Taber, the migratory labor.

Mr. TABER. To what extent does that enter into the picture?

Mr. SIMONS. We have asked for 24 camps in the State, accommodating 200 to the camp. That has been determined by the farmer committees, these defense committees in the counties. They have determined that.

Mr. TABER. Are you intending to recruit labor in your State and send them somewhere else, or are you looking all over the United States for recruits?

Mr. SIMONS. We are not depending too much on that labor. We had some last year, and it worked out satisfactorily.

Mr. TABER. I say, you do not intend to have your farm labor recruited and sent to other States?

Mr. SIMONS. I do not believe that we do.

Mr. TABER. Have you had any experience with that?

Mr. SIMONS. The farmers have had.

Mr. TABER. What are you going to do with this big problem for employing farm labor in States and shipping them into other States?

Mr. SIMONS. Of course, there is always a move from one State to another according to the cropping seasons. There is nothing new about labor moving back and forth over the country at the time of the planting and the harvesting seasons.

Mr. WOODRUM. I understood you to say that under the leadership of the extension service of New York State you undertook a few years ago——

Mr. SIMONS. In July 1940.

Mr. WOODRUM. To set up a plan. That was 2 years ago—a plan to meet the farm labor situation.

Mr. SIMONS. That is right.

Mr. WOODRUM. Somewhat similar to what we have here.

Mr. SIMONS. That is right.

Mr. WOODRUM. To what extent has it been able to solve the problem for you?

Mr. SIMONS. Of course, the problem has become more acute as we have gone along. In the beginning there was not much of a problem.

Last year, outside of the year-round labor, which is a very important thing, of course, we were able to take care of most of the needs of the seasonal cropping and planting very well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do you know the number of the people that you have to handle that?

Mr. SIMONS. Yes. I have it for the State.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Those people all come from within the State?

Mr. SIMONS. Of the set-up of 1,400, some 800 come from outside the State. They are the migratory labor that came in. Six hundred came from New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. You may continue with your statement.

Mr. SIMONS. In addition there were about 40,000 high-school boys and girls that were moved out of the cities and villages to work on the farms. That was done largely by the Farm Cadet Victory Corps of the State educational department.

I think that that is all the figures that I have.

Mr. TABER. Go ahead with your statement. Is that all of it?

Mr. SIMONS. That is all.

The State educational department organized this Farm Cadet Victory Corps, which is to be enlarged greatly this year, to take care of that part of it.

The war council has cooperated to the extent of granting 30 days' school leave to a boy or girl without losing the State age in that school, to work on farms. That has been very helpful in getting this large number of students out to the farms in the critical season, the harvest season.

Mr. O'NEAL. What were the ages of those students?

Mr. SIMONS. They were all high school students.

Mr. O'NEAL. Some of them were over 18?

Mr. SIMONS. They probably were. But there were very few. Of course, they will not be now.

Mr. SNYDER. You seem to be the first one who has mentioned the Farm Security Agency and the triple A as a unit in this plan that you

have put in the picture, and I might say that your plan sounds workable. Do you have those agencies in your State, and do they cooperate with you?

Mr. SIMONS. The triple A has not done anything except to find out the needs from this farm survey that was made. They are using those returned questionnaires to find out what the farmers will need.

Mr. SNYDER. What kind of cooperation have you had from the Farm Security Agency?

Mr. SIMONS. The Farm Security of the State had nothing to do with this except at the time when it had its original office at Upper Darby.

Mr. SNYDER. You mentioned 24 camps, I believe.

Mr. SIMONS. That is what I was asking for the coming year. We had four Farm Security camps last year and one converted C. C. camp, which the farmers themselves have operated with the help of the Farm Security.

Mr. SNYDER. That would come under the head of the 250, I believe, that you asked for or suggested in this set-up? That would be a portion of the 250?

Mr. SIMONS. Two hundred and fifty camps?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. SIMONS. It probably would. I do not know where your figure came from. That would be a part of it?

Mr. SNYDER. That would be a part of it?

Mr. SIMONS. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. My final question is, Do you believe that the enthusiasm among the school population, high schools and so forth, will produce a greater number of boys to go out this year than last year?

Mr. SIMONS. Yes. There is no doubt about it. We expect a large number, much more than last year, to go out there.

Mr. LUDLOW. With what success are you using these city people on the farm now? Is it a practical thing?

Mr. SIMONS. You are talking now about seasonal help or year-round help? There is quite a difference in the two.

Mr. LUDLOW. You might comment on both.

Mr. SIMONS. We tried a little experiment in there in getting some New York women at one of the schools to train year-round workers on dairy farms. We had about 20 from the State agricultural college at Farmingdale, L. I. They have been there now for several weeks under practical training. Some of the farmers have employed them to train skilled women to work with them.

Those people have not yet been placed on the farms. But on the basis of the experience last year in the seasonal workers that went up to Vermont, we feel that they will be useful on the farms.

As far as seasonal workers are concerned, the boys who went out from New York City last year, principally in the Hudson Valley, some of them living on the farms and some working on the farms and living in camps organized mostly by private organizations, farmers, and others, I believe that we found them very helpful. They needed a little training in the beginning by the farmer, but by and large I think the program is quite successful.

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness will be Mr. Goss.

STATEMENT OF ALBERT S. GOSS, MASTER OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARM COOPERATIVES, AND NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to have a statement from you, Mr. Goss.

Mr. GOSS. I will be brief.

When we testified last Monday, we were requested to see if we could get together on a unanimous recommendation with reference to the administration of this proposed labor problem.

We have had considerable discussion, interrupted by a number of things beyond our control. Yesterday afternoon the farm groups spent most of the afternoon together, and we argued on the proposals which would handle 90 or 95 percent of these men.

We were not entirely agreed on the proposals with reference to the interstate handling question. The groups represented yesterday were the Farm Bureau, the Cooperative Council, the Federation of Milk Producers, and three of the large cooperatives, and the Grange.

The Farm Bureau could not see eye to eye with us on one feature of it, and we have prepared a statement, signed by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, and the National Grange, which, I think, brings out the situation rather clearly.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you mind stating, Mr. Goss, those things on which everybody is in full accord?

Mr. GOSS. We are in full accord with reference to handling the situation within the States through the Extension Service. I think that the statement brings that out quite clearly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Go ahead with your statement.

Mr. GOSS. Last Monday Congressman Taber asked the opinion of the farm organizations on two questions relating to handling the problem of securing and placing farm labor. The first was for an expression of opinion as to where the Extension Service will be able to function on the labor problem and where it would not. The second question was whether most of what needs to be done could with little extra help.

It is our belief that there are some fundamental changes necessary in labor policies before any substantial relief can be afforded in a very serious labor situation. Until those changes are made, no agency in Government can administer the responsibilities of a farm-labor program successfully, and any agency which undertakes it will probably be subject to more or less criticism. The problem is to select the agency which can get the best results out of a most difficult situation.

We believe the responsibility rests primarily with the Secretary of Agriculture. He has at his command every agency of the Department of Agriculture including the Extension Service. Although the Extension Service is primarily an educational institution and should ordinarily confine its work to educational fields and avoid administra-

tive responsibilities, we believe its field organization is best equipped to handle the present emergency, and should be called on to perform the intrastate work purely as an emergency measure. We are glad to report that the Secretary of Agriculture has given us his assurance that it is his intention to place the responsibility upon that organization without duplication of effort in the field. We believe that the Extension Service can handle the intrastate work with less extra help than would be required to operate through any other agency.

The problem of handling the importation of foreign labor and the problem of migratory labor involve contacts with foreign governments, with different governmental departments, and with State governments. We believe these contacts should be made by the Secretary of Agriculture, his representatives, or such department or division as he may select from time to time to meet whatever situation may arise. Construction and operation of migratory labor camps are also involved. In the judgment of the Secretary and the Federal Director of Extension, the Extension Service is not equipped to handle many of these problems with maximum speed and effectiveness and we have seen no evidence to warrant questioning their judgment in the matter. On the contrary we believe that maximum efficiency can be attained if the Secretary is allowed a free hand to use any or all of the agencies at his command as circumstances warrant. We believe he should not be relieved of this responsibility. Not only should all facilities of his Department be at his disposal, but he should have the power as well, if in his judgment it is deemed necessary, to call on the United States Employment Service.

We believe Congress should set forth a policy for the guidance of the Secretary indicating clearly that all duplication in field offices and personnel should be avoided, and that no regulation should be established by the Department of Agriculture or the War Manpower Commission which would impose any restrictions on farm labor which are exempted under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the National Labor Relations Act.

We are in complete agreement that this labor problem is the most important problem in the agricultural field; that it will not be solved fully; that the better the approach the more crops we are going to have; and we are trying to map the course which will give us the maximum production.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a very interesting and informative statement. He makes clear one point that I was trying to bring out from the previous witness. There is a question in my mind how this proposed problem can be handled. The Extension Service is well organized in most States. It has the confidence of the people generally, but whether or not it can handle this migratory farm labor problem is a matter to which the committee will have to give much serious consideration.

Mr. GOSS. I just want to point this out—that fundamentally there is just that one difference. We are all agreed that the decentralization in the field on handling most of this farm labor can best be carried on through the Extension Service.

Mr. TABER. When you get down to the point of handling these camps, the individual camps, would not the Extension Service be able to handle that better than importing somebody from the outside?

Mr. Goss. We have felt that that is a responsibility which the Secretary should determine, using the facilities which are best equipped to handle it in his judgment.

Mr. TABER. They brought up a lot of stuff here for the cost of putting up camps that was just outlandish, like $500 for a flag pole, and a lot of such stuff as that. No Extension Service man of any account would go into that kind of picture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There are several hundred abandoned camps which were formerly used by the Civilian Conservation Corps. Several such camps, or rather the vacant buildings, are located in the district that I have the honor of representing. I had a telegram today saying that one of them was being moved out of the district 100 miles away.

Now, that is right in the heart of an agricultural district. The Government of the United States has more than $25,000 invested in that one camp. It has all the modern facilities including natural gas and modern toilets. It will house more than 200 farm workers. To utilize such buildings would be much more practical than the proposed shelters that are provided for in this bill.

Why should not the Secretary of Agriculture by the direction of Congress be given those several hundred C. C. C. camps without any appreciable additional expense at all, especially where such camps are located in the heart of agricultural districts? For instance, there are two such vacant modern camps in Blaine County, Okla. The two of them cost approximately $50,000. Both have all the conveniences that you have in a modern hotel in Washington.

It occurs to me that they might be utilized rather than going to the expense, trouble and delay of building what they call shelters with $500 flag poles. The flag poles are already up in these C. C. C. camps which would be much better homes than could be provided for in the bill under consideration.

The next witness will be Mr. Davis.

STATEMENT OF T. O. DAVIS, DIRECTOR OF THE EXTENSION SERVICE, ALABAMA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE, AUBURN, ALA.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my statement will be brief.

I am in general accord with the statements that have been made here this morning, that have been presented by Mr. Ogg and Mr. Goss and Director Simons.

I recognize this as a big problem, this labor job for the farmers. As an extension director for one State I am not anxious to get hold of it. But I do believe that the Extension Service is the proper agency for handling it. Under war conditions certainly every public official has it as his duty to do the very best he possibly can with everything that he has to do.

In my State I think we would proceed, first, in close cooperation with the farmers themselves on the State level and also on the country and community level.

The first step, I believe, would be to ascertain from each farmer the labor that he needs, the kind of labor and when he needs it, the same way that I would run a factory or do anything else. And then I

would ascertain on the other side the possible workers that are available for doing that job.

I agree, also, with the evidence here that most of that labor, a very big portion of it, in fact, must come from within the State and even from within the county. I do not see any big outside labor pool that could be drawn on from any source except, I will say, certain seasonal labor that may be used for harvesting or for moving over to another State where the harvest is a little different or at a different date.

In addition to then ascertaining from the farmers their need for labor and when they need it, and the time and the available supply, which I believe in my State will include largely the youth in the schools, nonfarm youth in the main, and also women—and in that connection I would like to point out that it is my understanding that in England they have some 50,000 or 60,000 women who are in the Woman's Volunteer Army, working on farms; and I believe that the English farmers were very much like the farmers in my State and perhaps other States. At first they did not want women out there as hired men, so to speak. They did not relish the idea. But recent surveys reveal that those women, practically all of them from cities, are remarkably helpful; not as good as the old hired man that they had, but surprisingly helpful and satisfactory in view of the fact that they came out from the cities. That is revealed by reports that have been brought back from recent surveys.

Now, there is another big problem in this, and that is to train the farmers to use this labor, and also to get their attitudes to make the very best possible use of it.

I have had some farmers in my State to say, "I would not give a darn for those town boys." I can understand why they have that feeling. But on the other hand, in wartime we have got to admit that our men who are fighting in the jungles and under the sea and in the air are not all under ideal conditions. So they have to have somebody out there on the farm, and we are going to do the best that we can with what we have.

That is going to be our approach to that labor problem.

So then we find what is needed, and we find what is available. Then we go to work to bring the two together when needed and where needed.

That is going to involve, I think, maybe using some of our school busses for transporting that seasonal labor. If we cannot find places in the farm homes—and I believe, by the way, that California was rather successful last year in youth camps in groups of around 50, and they camped in school buildings, consolidated school buildings. They say that it worked out nicely. That is the report that I have been told from California.

They are using school busses for transportation. They used school buildings to live in.

I like the idea that someone mentioned a moment ago about taking these C. C. C. camps. Those buildings are demountable. I understand that they are in the hands of the War Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Some of them might not be demountable. The first ones that were constructed were not demountable. But I think that the majority of them are.

Mr. DAVIS. I believe that in my State some 8 or 10 of them are vacant unless they have been put into use in the last month or so, and I believe that all of those are demountable.

Those could easily be moved over, and they are very comfortable for housing these people. Of course, that can be done in a short time and at a very low cost.

Mr. LUDLOW. Was the standard compensation paid to these boys who came out from the cities to work on the farms in your State? What percentage of the normal wage did they get?

Mr. DAVIS. I was referring to California.

Now, we have done a great deal of that in Alabama. It is my understanding generally that that is always at the prevailing rate or at the going rate locally, as they call it, for doing that farm work.

Mr. LUDLOW. The full going rate?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. It is done so much per unit. It is all paid on a per unit basis or at the going rate that they have.

Mr. TABER. Do they pay the real young boys the same as these older ones?

Mr. DAVIS. As I understand it, a lot of this work is done at so much per gallon harvested or per unit of work done. It is on the unit basis. That is my understanding. I am not entirely familiar with that.

Mr. GEORGE WILSON, California Farm Bureau. When we put them in, we pay them a little above. The Mexican labor has a pay limit. They do not like to see them come in. So even though they cost a little more, it is worth it. We get a little more out of them than the other fellows. They try to keep up with the boys and show the boys that they are a little better than them.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a message, by the way, from the Director of the Extension Service in California, in which his position on this is very similar or the same, I would say, to what I have stated here, namely, that they are still doing the major part of the job within their State, and then, if it becomes necessary to have an arrangement or agreement with some other agency like, for example, the U. S. Employment Service, for intrastate help, if it is available, then the Extension Service would make that agreement or that arrangement and handle the labor accordingly.

And I believe I might say, Mr. Wilson, in your presence that it is my understanding that normally California uses about one-seventh of all the hired farm labor in the United States. I believe that the census shows that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. You live pretty close to Florida to be talking about California.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. I think they have a similar problem down there on labor.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would just summarize what I have said by saying that it looks as though the Extension Service is the agency that is best equipped to handle this job with the cooperation that the Extension Service would see fit of other agencies.

I certainly would oppose having divided authority or a divided responsibility. We do not have time for that. And, of course, we know that it does not work out satisfactorily in anything.

That is all that I have to say.

Mr. TABER. Do you contemplate much labor being brought into your State?

Mr. DAVIS. Importing it from other States?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. No. In my State I do not think that that is true.

Mr. TABER. Do you contemplate sending any labor out of your State?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not see where there would be any unless there should be a little seasonal labor that would be available to go into, we will say, other States to help some in a particular harvest, like they have in Florida.

Mr. TABER. It would not be substantial?

Mr. DAVIS. No. And I think that it would be very temporary. That is my thinking on it.

Mr. SNYDER. Such as picking oranges?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. We could get some like that.

We have a little different situation in Baldwin County, which is on the south end of my State. We contemplate moving some labor from another part of the State down there, because that is a trucking county. It is different from most of the States in its agriculture.

Mr. TARVER. Do I understand that you say that the major portion of the labor used on this program will be from within the State?

Mr. DAVIS. A very big portion.

Mr. TARVER. And that the interstate transportation of labor will be small in comparison with the other?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. That is certainly true in Alabama.

Mr. TARVER. Out of this contemplated $65,000,000 some $40,000,000 is contemplated to be expended for interstate transportation of workers.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. That is long-distance labor. That is correct.

Mr. TARVER. That could only be utilized in some program to persuade the Alabama farmer to move in large numbers to other sections of the country where they would have more fertile land and things of that sort?

Mr. DAVIS. I think your statement is correct. I do not think that this is the time to be transplanting farmers. I believe that now is the time to be using them and to be making the best use out of what we have.

Mr. TARVER. Do you not think that this portion of the program as submitted in this budget is largely a program for transplanting farmers?

Mr. DAVIS. That is what it says.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith, we would be glad to have a statement from you as to the conditions in the Corn Belt and any recommendations that you may have for the application of our labor problem to the Corn Belt particularly.

STATEMENT OF EARL SMITH, PRESIDENT, ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION, AND VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I did not come over prepared to testify; but I do not hesitate to say that I am in full agreement that the most serious problem confronting the Nation within agriculture is this manpower situation.

To me the question is divided into about four parts. One is the question of getting enough experienced skilled labor. I do not know where you are going to get that except by keeping boys at home. There have altogether to many of them been taken into the Army. There are a lot of experienced, operating boys.

The other is, insofar as it is possible to do so, to get action by the highest officials of the Government who would at least make available, and immediately available, for this planting and cultivating season experienced boys out of the Army to the extent that they would want to take advantage of the availability for furlough, and recognizing them from the standpoint that there is where they are needed most for the next 6 months at least.

We have heard a great deal about the importance of harvesting. But it is even more important to get the ground in proper shape for seeding and to get the crops planted and to have intelligent and effective cultivation.

You can spread over a larger period than in normal times the period of harvesting with many crops. In other words, a farm man can work a longer time in harvesting the crops. I am not minimizing that.

What is the next problem? It is to get enough boys available to work under the direction of experienced people.

No doubt we are all in agreement—I heard the Secretary of Agriculture say, and I heard the statement of the Grange. I heard the statement of the Farm Bureau and the Extension Service, that about 90 percent of all of this work has got to be done within our States, training local boys and finding people to do this work.

I do not hesitate to say that I do not know of any agency that even starts to compare with the Extension Services in the handling of this work, which we all admit is about 90 percent of the immediate job in this field.

When it comes to seasonal labor, which is to a large extent transitory labor and which often crosses State lines, I would rather not testify to that. We do not have very much of that in the State of Illinois.

But I do know that the seasons of harvest for the same type of crop vary. And throughout normal times boys from Illinois have gone out into the Kansas wheat fields. They help out in Missouri. They go out for a period of 2 or 3 weeks and go from farm to farm. That has been done ever since I have been a farmer, which is 35 years.

When it comes to who should run this whole show, the thing that worries me is this: One of the recommendations here this morning was, "Put the full responsibility in the Secretary of Agriculture and let him use any agency to do the job."

He is overwhelmed with responsibilities to start with. Experience teaches us that the result of that kind of responsibility is overlapping and duplication and extravagance.

My experience in business teaches me definitely that where you place responsibility you must place authority to discharge the responsibility. That was on the program of the American Farm Bureau in saying that, since 90 percent of this has got to be done within the State and the Extension Service, where all of us agree is the best place to do that job, why not place all the responsibility in the Extension

Service, which is in the Department of Agriculture? That will close the door to duplication and make available to the Extension Service through agreements with other agencies of the Government for particular types of work, such as was mentioned in this American Farm Bureau statement—the United States Employment Service or other agencies—to do certain types of things as called for by the Extension Service directors of the respective States.

My experience with the extension directors of the States is that they borrow pretty largely from the Government agencies from their accumulated information. And I think I know enough about the county agents in our section of the country to know that they are not going to permit anybody to come in and recruit labor to go somewhere else when we acutely need it ourselves, regardless of any pressure from Washington. He would not be the county agent very long if he did not follow the wishes and needs of the county. Therefore the wishes of the farmers will be reflected in any information that he sends forward to the State.

I just want to say briefly that I cannot conceive of meeting this problem, as acute as it is. Everybody admits that it has fallen down thus far. I hope to see the Extension Service accept the responsibility, because I am afraid that it is going to be so late that we are inviting some responsibility to be placed there for a failure that does not really belong to them.

But, as I understand it, they are willing to accept that responsibility provided they are given the authority to do the job. I believe that they are very much better equipped than any other group in America. They uniformly could apply policies all over the country and adapt them to local needs. Knowing that they operate out of the United States Department of Agriculture, I think that that is the best move that can be made at this time.

Mr. LUDLOW. You come from an agricultural State where mechanized farming has been highly developed?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. How are you going to operate your farms with this specialized machinery with untrained workers?

Mr. SMITH. Of course, no farmer can accomplish more than he has the tools and the help to accomplish. This is a very serious problem. And I want to emphasize one of the reasons why I am emphasizing the importance of experienced and skilled help, even though he might be there only temporarily, getting these boys from the farms that have that experience.

When you put an untrained boy, teach him for a few weeks and put him out in the field with some of this complicated machinery—and it is not as simple to run as an automobile by a long shot—you are inviting a break-down in the machinery. And you cannot even get the repairs. At least, you cannot get them promptly. And we do not have time to wait for them now.

Mr. LUDLOW. And that problem is an equally important problem with the farm labor supply.

Mr. SMITH. Absolutely.

Mr. LUDLOW. Is there any possibility of getting some priorities for these parts?

Mr. SMITH. Of course, we have been assured that allocations of raw materials for the building of farm machinery will be greatly

stepped up this year over last year. But so far as I know, no order has been issued yet.

But it is one thing to allocate and it is another thing to have. We actually have a machinery shortage on the farms. The machinery repair part shortage is much more serious than the present figures of allocations would seem to indicate, because you can allocate all you please, but if you don't get the materials, you do not get the machinery built and you do not get delivery, and through some of these concentration orders we will not even permit delivery of the machinery that is already in existence. It is a very serious thing.

FRIDAY, MARCH 5, 1943.

STATEMENTS OF HON. CLAUDE R. WICKARD, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE; WAYNE DARROW, ADMINISTRATOR OF FARM LABOR ADMINISTRATION; DR. M. L. WILSON, DIRECTOR OF EXTENSION SERVICE; R. LYLE WEBSTER, ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY; AND R. W. MAYCOCK, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

AGRICULTURAL LABOR ADMINISTRATION

The CHAIRMAN. By directive No. 17, dated January 23, 1943, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission gave full jurisdiction to the Secretary of Agriculture over the farm labor program, subject to policies and standards of the War Manpower Commission.

The President allotted $4,500,000 from his emergency fund to inaugurate the program. It was assigned to the Food Production Agency of which Mr. Parisius was the head, and under him to Major Walker. Both of those men are out of the program, as I understand it, and Mr. Parisius is out of the Department.

You, Mr. Secretary, were here before the committee on February 17 on this program, and on March 1 the Agricultural Labor Administration was set up. Can you tell us what is the status of the Agricultural Labor Administration in the Department; whether it is attached to the Food Administration, or whether it is a separate entity; whether it reports directly to you, and so forth? Will you please give us some information on its status?

Secretary WICKARD. I had the Agricultural Labor Administration set up directly responsible to me. There were several reasons for this. The chief reason was that I consider this the most difficult of all of our problems and the most important, and I want it directly under me, because I have to know what is going on.

We also have problems, labor problems, in food distribution and processing fields, and we have to work with the Selective Service and a number of other governmental agencies. It did not seem to me quite proper to have this placed solely in the food production field, which deals mainly with farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. What duties have you assigned to the Agricultural Labor Administration?

Mr. MAYCOCK. The clerk of your committee has a copy of the order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I have before me Memorandum No. 1075, which has to do with the estabilshment of the Agricultural Labor Administration. This memorandum will be placed in the record at this point.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 1, 1943,

MEMORANDUM No. 1075

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL LABOR ADMINISTRATION

In order that the farm labor program may be further unified and more closely integrated to carry out the responsibilities assigned to the Department by Executive Order No. 9280 of December 5, 1942, and by the regulations and directives issued by the Economic Stabilization Director and the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. There is hereby established in the Department of Agriculture an Agricultural Labor Administration, which shall be under the direction and supervision of a Director of Agricultural Labor.

2. The Director or, in his absence or inability to act, an Acting Director to be named by him shall, as personal representative of and under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary, be responsible for the labor activities carried out by the Department including the development, integration, and administration of programs for securing and effectively using agricultural manpower, programs, for the operation of mobile and permanent labor centers, and such programs relating to farm wage rates and farm wage stabilization as may be necessary to carry out farm wage responsibilities of the Department; the investigation and presentation to appropriate Government agencies of the labor problems of the food processing and distributing industries; and the performance of all liaison with other Government agencies dealing with labor.

3. The functions and personnel of the Agricultural Labor Branch of the Food Production Administration are hereby transferred to the Agricultural Labor Administration. The farm labor activities of the Farm Security Administration of the Food Production Administration, and of the other agencies of the Department, including the Food Distribution Administration, the Extension Service, the Office of Personnel, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, are to be carried out in conformity with the policies and procedures developed by the Director of Agricultural Labor.

4. The Director may discharge the responsibilities imposed upon him by this memorandum in such manner and through such agencies of the Department as he shall designate and he is authorized, in his discretion and subject to the applicable laws and regulations, to make such delegations of authority as are necessary to the effective discharge of such responsibilities.

Mr. Wayne H. Darrow is hereby designated as the Director of Agricultural Labor.

6. All previous memoranda are superseded to the extent that they conflict or are inconsistent with the provisions of this memorandum.

This memorandum shall be effective March 1, 1943.

CLAUDE R. WICKARD, *Secretary.*

The CHAIRMAN. Who has been put in charge of this program, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary WICKARD. Mr. Wayne Darrow.

The CHAIRMAN. You have had a number of changes in the handling of this program. Are they in any way related to or the result of criticism of the manner in which this question has been handled?

Secretary WICKARD. You mean, for instance, from outside of my own——

The CHAIRMAN. Any criticism, either your own, or this committee's, or outside. There has been no criticism by this committee. We merely made inquiry of you.

Secretary WICKARD. I will be quite frank about it. I have not always succeeded in getting people who had enough imagination and drive to take the responsibility, which somebody must take, in this field. I have been devoting a lot of my own personal time to it over the last 2 years.

Mr. TABER. Has not that been the trouble, that they have had too much imagination, and nothing else?

Secretary WICKARD. No. I think most of our people in the Department have not seen the great problems ahead of us—that would be my criticism. We have always looked upon the farm people as having too much labor, and that farm wages were too low, and a lot of things which were true in peacetime. But I think they could not just see that we could make as great a change as we have made because of the war—one of our troubles in all of this has been to be able to see how great the change has been; and what I have been trying to do is to get somebody to look ahead and to be sure that we play on the safe side so far as labor is concerned and have enough.

I have led the movement for deferment of farm labor. A lot of people were critical, thinking that I was trying to interfere with recruitment for the Army. I have always maintained that food production is of highest importance, and that we could not take chances by taking trained workers away.

Also I have had in mind that we are going to have a lot of difficulty in getting people who usually help us out in seasonal work to come back to the farms. Other people have not felt that we have had that difficulty, and today there is yet a great difference of opinion.

Yesterday, General Hershey brought over all of his regional men, and all agreed, with one or two exceptions—one man on the west coast was pretty optimistic about the labor supply——

The CHAIRMAN. That is the labor supply generally?

Secretary WICKARD. The farm labor supply. I told him that some people perhaps might be too pessimistic. On the other hand, I thought they were too optimistic, although they were out in the field, and it is rather difficult to refute persons who are dealing directly with the problem every day, as they have been dealing with this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. You have put Mr. Darrow in charge?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is Mr. Darrow's background and experience?

Secretary WICKARD. If you do not mind, I will ask Mr. Darrow to state his background and experience.

Mr. DARROW. I was born in New York State. I went to Cornell; graduated in agriculture in 1916. I went to west Texas to farm. I was farming there in 1916, 1917 and 1918, during the war, raising wheat. In 1919 I became county agent, in Floyd County, the adjoining county. Then from there, in 1920, I went to A. & M. College as a district agent in extension. I had southwest Texas as my territory. In 1926 I became extension editor, and served there until the triple A days.

In 1934 I became field representative in the Southwest and came to Washington in 1937 in charge of field work and information. I became director of the Division of Information of the triple A in late 1938.

Recently I became associate director of the Office of Information for the Department, in charge of all the war information campaigns, and from that the Secretary called me into this position.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, will the Agricultural Labor Administration have full charge of all policies in connection with this work?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It will issue all orders?

Secretary WICKARD. Under me.

The CHAIRMAN. And directives, under you?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And it will, under your direction, operate the program?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the Farm Security Administration have anything to do with the farm labor policy?

Secretary WICKARD. No, sir; I want to determine those policies in my office; all policies.

The CHAIRMAN. Some of the national farm organizations have complained that the F. S. A. has attempted to impose agreements on farmers in connection with labor; standardizing requirements as to housing, minimum wages, living conditions, beyond those normally enjoyed by the farmers themselves.

Secretary WICKARD. If such is true, of course, I have no sympathy with it.

There has been one issue which I think I should speak about quite frankly, and which I believe we are going to work out shortly to the satisfaction of most people at least, and that is the minimum wage for people doing piece work.

The question arose only, so far as I know, in the cotton picking area in Arizona. We had entered into an agreement with Mexico for the importation of Mexican laborers, and one of the things that was put in that agreement was a minimum wage for these people.

When the Farm Security Administration interpreted that clause—which we said was no more than fair; if it was fair for Mexicans it should be applied also to our own citizens—there was a question as to whether everybody had to get $3 a day, which was the minimum wage, or whether that should be applied only to able-bodied people, the average worker.

In my discussions of this question before the Manpower Commission and with the people in Mexico, it had been my understanding, although it may never have been made sufficiently plain by me, that that was for the average worker, so that he could make an income of $3 a day.

I remember one time saying that I did not expect the children or old people, or people who might be incapacitated for one reason or another, all to get this minimum wage.

Recently we have been trying to work out with some of the people in Arizona and some of the people who represent the cotton farmers and the cotton industry a satisfactory solution of this problem.

I do not think that I can—and I know I cannot so far as Mexico is concerned, and I do not think I should—say that these people that we transport, that we recruit and transport, should be left without

any wage guaranties of any kind. I think if we do, we will not get them. I know we will not get them from Mexico. I am sure that we just have to provide some sort of wage standard, and also some sort of working conditions which will be reasonable.

I do not know in every instance what they have received in the way of housing conditions, but all I said was that we would give them the best conditions that were available. We could not expect to give them running water and electric lights, and refrigerators, and a lot of things of that kind. Nobody ever expected that we could. I have heard it said that we did.

I have also heard that there have been stories circulating in Congress about the kind of menus that we gave these people, allowing them to choose their meals. I think some of those stories have proved to be unfounded.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the farm organizations—I believe two or three of them—that appeared before us yesterday, said that they had consulted with you and you had said that you would delegate this work to the Extension Service.

Secretary WICKARD. I told the farm organization people who have come to see me several times—the Farm Bureau and all of them—that I thought the Extension Service should handle the intrastate work, so far as getting the volunteer workers, helping the farmers find help, acting as a clearinghouse for them. But when it came to the interstate movement, they were not equipped, and in my opinion a great majority of the Extension people do not want to attempt that sort of thing. Mr. Wilson is here, and he may want to talk to that when you call upon him. I think at the present time it would be very unsatisfactory.

For instance, we are sending two men today to the Bahamas to try to get help for the vegetable people along the east coast, starting in Florida. They must get camps located. They must take care of these people, get them from one State to the other. I really do not think the Extension Service people want that sort of a job and I do not think they should be asked to take it, although some people may disagree with me.

MOVEMENT OF INTERSTATE WORKERS

The CHAIRMAN. I believe you said that in your program you expect to get 350,000 interstate workers; workers whom you would carry across States lines, from one State to another, from one area to another. What reasonable prospect is there of securing 350,000 agricultural laborers who will have to be transported from one State to another?

Secretary WICKARD. I question whether we are going to get as many as we would like to have, or perhaps this number, although we have a lot of people that will show up for this sort of work. Apparently they like to do that sort of thing, and I hope that we will be successful in getting them. But I do not know that we can guarantee to get that number any more than we can guarantee that we will be successful in getting any other number.

The CHAIRMAN. The suggestion has been made that 90 or 95 percent of these workers would be secured within the State in which they were to be used. What do you think of that?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes. We think we are going to have to have altogether perhaps three and a half to four million people working on farms who are not employed on those farms all the year round, or what we call permanent farm workers.

The CHAIRMAN. And you say that that would cover perhaps 90 or 95 percent of them?

Secretary WICKARD. No. I was going to say that if we got 350,000 or 400,000, that would be exactly 10 percent of the three and a half to four million people—10 percent of the total number of people involved. Ninety percent would have to be recruited within the States.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, in view of the fact that you do not expect to get the full 350,000——

Secretary WICKARD. I am not sure. We have to, if we possibly can, but we cannot guarantee it.

The CHAIRMAN. Then that means that somewhere between 90 and 95 percent will be secured within the States themselves.

Secretary WICKARD. I hope so; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And if you were going to turn that over to the Extension Service, that would mean that the Extension Service would do about 90 or 95 percent of the work, would it not?

Secretary WICKARD. It all depends on what you mean by doing the work. I am hoping that most of these people will be taken from the schools, from towns, from stores; some of them may only work 2 weeks; some of them may work just during the summer vacation, for 2 or 3 months.

But these workers that we are talking about, we hope we can retain them through the entire season. So there is the difficulty, of course, of getting them and housing them and transporting them, looking after them, and the work involved in a lot of ways would be much more per person than it would be for the people who live in the community and who go out to the farms, and perhaps part of them back in the evenings, or go back home week-ends, at least.

The CHAIRMAN. But it will all be within the State?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

AGENCIES TO BE UTILIZED IN PROGRAM

The CHAIRMAN. And that will be under the Extension Service. Now, if the Extension Service is to handle 90 or 95 percent of this problem, would it not be better to turn the whole problem over to them instead of having a divided authority, a divided responsibility, a divided operation?

Secretary WICKARD. My opinion is that the Extension Service is not fitted, not adapted, and does not want to accept this responsibility. It is international, even, in some aspects of it, and I think it ought to be kept under the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us see what agencies will have a part in this program. What part of the program do you expect to give the Extension Service; what part, the Farm Security Administration; what part, the A. A. A.; what part, the war boards; what part the Employment Service, and so forth?

Let us take first the Extension Service. What do you expect to give the Extension service?

Secretary WICKARD. Mr. Chairman, first I think it will be the place where farmers for the most part would come asking for help. The Extension Service county agent would be watching the situation, to see what the needs would be. The Extension Service would be the people who would get in touch with all organizations within the State, to enlist their support and help in getting the farm workers; school people, service clubs, women's clubs, and everybody in the State who could help out in the recruiting and supplying of local labor.

The CHAIRMAN. What part would the Farm Security Administration have?

Secretary WICKARD. The Farm Security Administration would be confined to the transportation of the interstate movement and the international movement. They will not be entirely in charge of it. As I said, Mr. Darrow is sending a man to the Bahamas, Mr. Fred Morrell, who has been in charge of the C. C. C. camps which have now been abolished. He has just finished up that work and we have gotten him to work in the Labor Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. What will be the part of the A. A. A. in this program?

Secretary WICKARD. At the present time, the war boards, of which the A. A. A. chairman is the head in the counties, are carrying out the canvassing of farmers to see what their needs are, both from the standpoint of labor, machinery, fertilizers, and other things, and they are expected to assemble that information and make it available to us; and if farmers in the neighborhood want to get together and exchange machinery or help, or anything of the kind, the A. A. A. committees are there to help out in that particular endeavor.

The CHAIRMAN. The United States Department of Agriculture war boards; what part will they have?

Secretary WICKARD. The war boards are composed of various heads of organizations in the county and in the State, and the triple A man is chairman. But the Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Forestry Service, the Farm Credit Administration people are all represented on these boards, and they meet and discuss local problems and how they may approach them.

The CHAIRMAN. And the United States Employment Service?

Secretary WICKARD. The United States Employment Service activities, so far as I know, will be confined entirely—that is my impression, at least—to helping get workers from the larger cities, to discourage, for instance, the hiring of farm workers by the people in the factories, when there is a shortage in the area; but always working very closely with the State people at least in the whole labor problem.

The CHAIRMAN. And the War Manpower Commission?

Secretary WICKARD. The War Manpower Commission, I think, now has regional directors in all of the 12 regions, which corresponds to the War Production Board regional set-up. They are asking me to name a representative for each region. That is another reason why I hope we get this appropriation as quickly as possible, so that I may get people permanently appointed to represent the Department of Agriculture, working under Mr. Darrow, in the labor organization of the Department of Agriculture, so that we can press our claims, our problems to the War Manpower Commission regional offices, hoping thereby that we have an effective means of stopping the recruiting

of farm labor for industry, and also getting people in the cities to help us out as much as possible in getting people for farm work.

AGRICULTURAL LABOR ADMINISTRATION

The CHAIRMAN. This new organization that you are setting up, the Agricultural Labor Administration—will all of the employees in the States have to be O. K.'d by this Division here in Washington?

Secretary WICKARD. Mr. Wilson, could you answer that?

The CHAIRMAN. How will you operate? How will you discharge your functions? Each employee in the State will have to be O. K.'d by the division here in Washington, is that correct?

Mr. WILSON. I would not think so. I would think that the Secretary would designate certain specific functions to the Extension Service, and the Extension Service, which is a cooperative type of service between the Federal Government and the States, represented by the State extension director, would carry out those assignments that have been made to it through the Labor Administrator, and that that would not involve any great change, particularly if it were confined to the four lines of work that we have assumed would be assigned to us, which are the mobilization of labor within the county, the mobilization of the high-school youths, and of those women that cared to work on the farms, together with some educational training for these people that have never worked on farms before.

APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS TO AGENCIES

The CHAIRMAN. How will the funds be administered? Will they be apportioned by States, to the States, or will the money all be expended directly under the charge of the Washington office here?

Secretary WICKARD. For the Extension Service, I do not think we want to use the usual plans of apportionment. Mr. Wilson had better answer that.

Mr. WILSON. We have assumed that the money which would be assigned to the Extension Service would be allocated to the States on the basis of the labor problem within the States, and that this could not be handled the same as the regular grants which Congress makes to the Extension Service under the Smith-Lever, the Capper-Ketcham, and the Bankhead-Jones Acts, whereby lump sums are apportioned to States on the basis of rural or of farm population, and that money is allocated to the State and, of course, disbursed by the State.

We had assumed that with Federal funds of this kind, an allotment would be made to a State, and a memorandum or agreement between the extension director and the Secretary of Agriculture would be developed which would be a plan; and that since these were Federal funds and not State-grant funds, they would be disbursed in the usual way as Federal funds.

DEFERMENT OF FARM LABOR

The CHAIRMAN. The Secretary has to leave at 11 o'clock and I should like to ask him just a few more questions.

Secretary WICKARD. Mr. Chairman, before you ask another question, may I add a little information as to the duties of the war boards?

These things move pretty rapidly. Mr. Darrow has been working with the Selective Service people and has an agreement which I believe will be announced today, with them, that the county war boards will be given the authority and will be requested to ask for deferment of all farm boys; because heretofore a lot of the farm boys have not taken it upon themselves, nor have their fathers taken it upon themselves, to ask for deferment. We have asked the war boards to fill in what is known as Form 42–A, asking for all farm people to be immediately classified, to see whether they are to be left on the farms, so that we will not have a lot of them leaving the farms who are now there either because they think they are not needed or because of the draft.

That was to be announced today.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you put a copy of that announcement in the record, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes. That is one of the war duties of the war boards which is being given them, and which I think is going to be one of the beneficial things in the way of preventing a further depletion of farm labor.

(The statement requested is as follows:)

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

A four-point program to keep necessary agricultural workers on the farm and to insure production of vital commodities for this Nation and its allies through cooperation between the Selective Service Bureau of the War Manpower Commission and the Department of Agriculture was announced today by War Manpower Commission Chairman Paul V. McNutt.

At the same time, Selective Service disclosed that some 6,500 farm workers daily are being placed in a deferred status where they will remain as long as they continue on their jobs and remain essential to agricultural production. Holding of essential workers on farms is one of the major goals of the labor program of the Agricultural Labor Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

The four points of the program are:

1. Department of Agriculture State and county war boards have been authorized and instructed by Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard to seek deferment of farm workers whom they believe to be necessary when the worker or his employer fails to request deferment and to take appeals from local board decisions regarding agricultural workers when they believed such action is justified.

2. Whenever local boards in the process of classifying registrants, find a registrant who is engaged in agriculture but not producing a sufficient number of agricultural units to warrant his classification in class II–C or class III–C, the special classes for agricultural workers, they will refer the registrant to a war board and allow 30 days for his placement where he can produce the required number of units.

3. Instruction to local boards that they will classify in class II–C or class III–C any registrant who has had agricultural experiences but who has left the farm for other work provided he returns to agriculture and becomes regularly engaged in and essential to it prior to his receipt of an order to report for induction into the armed forces.

4. Instruction to local boards that they are not to reclassify out of a deferred classification a farm worker who is regularly engaged in and necessary to an agricultural endeavor essential to the support of the war effort even if failure to reclassify means that calls for military manpower remain unfilled.

The new instructions to local boards, contained in Local Board Memorandum 164–A, supplementing Local Board Memorandum 164 which advised of the creation of class II–C and class III–C for agricultural workers deferred solely on the basis of occupation and for agricultural workers with dependents, said:

"Prior to this time it has been the policy of the Department of Agriculture to have State and county war boards not concern themselves with the cases of individual registrants. However, the Department of Agriculture has now directed State and country war boards to initiate and file requests for the deferment of certain registrants whom they consider necessary to and regularly engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors and whose deferment has not been otherwise requested.

"Such requests should be supported with full information concerning the registrant's activities. Local boards will give the same consideration to the classification of a registrant in class II–C or class III–C, based upon information furnished by a State or county war board, as they would to information furnished by a registrant or his employer.

"The Department of Agriculture has also directed war boards to appeal from local board decisions denying registrants classification in class II–C or class III–C whenever they feel such appeals are justified."

Heretofore a registrant engaged in agriculture who failed to qualify for classification in class II–C or class III–C because of his failure to produce a sufficient number of units of essential farm products was referred to a local employment office of the War Manpower Commission and 30 days was allowed for the placement of the worker in an agricultural occupation where he could produce the required number of units. Under the new program such a registrant will be referred to a county war board for placement where he can produce the required number of essential war units for his classification in class II–C or class III–C. Usually, the minimum number of units required for the placement of any farm workers in class II–C or class III–C is eight. These are fixed by a formula worked out by the Department of Agriculture and are based on dairy, livestock, poultry, and agricultural production.

As to registrants returning to agriculture, the local board memorandum asserts:

"A registrant who is skilled in agriculture, either by reason of education or experience, who returns to an agricultural occupation or endeavor and becomes necessary to and regularly engaged in such agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, should be deferred in class II–C or class III–C so long as he remains so engaged or until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained. If, however, a registrant returns to an agricultural occupation or endeavor after the local board has mailed to him his order to report for induction, he should not be accorded consideration for classification in class II–C or class III–C irrespective of his previous experience or education along agricultural lines."

Pointing out that Congress has delegated to local boards the administrative responsibility of deciding when and under what set of circumstances a registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the support of the war effort, the memorandum said:

"Having made its decision that an individual registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, the local board has no further discretion and must defer the registrant. No desire to meet calls for manpower should in any manner influence the local board's decision.

"Calls which cannot be met without taking registrants considered necessary to and regularly engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort, should be left unfilled."

Agencies of the Selective Service System may contact and consult with war boards and be contacted and consulted by them regarding an individual registrant under the new program and local boards may make full use of the information which is available in the files of the county war boards, the memorandum emphasized.

As to registrants now being transferred to class II–C and class III–C, Selective Service said that nearly 500,000 farm workers have been placed in these classes in recent weeks. Some 171,600 workers were transferred to class II–C and class III–C in January alone. The present daily rate of transfer amounts to nearly 6,500 workers. Over half of these men, had they not been transferred, would in all probability have been inducted into the armed forces, depriving agriculture of their services.

By the end of 1943 an estimated total of 3,032,000 farm workers will have been classified in class II–C or class III–C, Selective Service said.

AGRICULTURAL LABOR ADMINISTRATION

The CHAIRMAN. How many officers and employees will be required by the Agricultural Labor Administration?

Secretary WICKARD. Mr. Darrow has four at the present time, including himself.

The CHAIRMAN. How many will be required?

Secretary WICKARD. We will have to have 12 people for these various regional offices, which the War Manpower Commission are pressing us very hard to name, and I want to get that done as quickly as possible.

AGENCIES TO BE UTILIZED IN PROGRAM

The CHAIRMAN. Out of this $65,000,000 that is to be spent for administration and supervision, how much of it is to be expended by the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. MAYCOCK. We estimate approximately $40,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. And by the Extension Service?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Approximately $6,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. And by the Agricultural Labor Administration?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Approximately $1,000,000, I would say.

The CHAIRMAN. And by the United States Department of Agriculture war boards and the A. A. A.?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Approximately—somewhere between $100,000 and $150,000.

The CHAIRMAN. How much is for additional farm labor camps and shelters?

Mr. MAYCOCK. The amount for additional farm labor centers, operation and construction, totals $17,472,072.

The CHAIRMAN. How much for their supervision and operation?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Supervision and operation is included within the $17,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. And also for existing facilities?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Yes. That is to operate during this crop season, from the time the appropriation is made available until December 31 of this calendar year, the 95 camps which are in existence, in addition to those which we will construct if the funds are made available.

AUTHORITY TO FIX MINIMUM WAGES, REGULATE WORKING HOURS, HOUSING STANDARDS, ETC.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, this question has arisen—and you have referred to it just now. Is there any authority under which the Farm Security Administration can fix minimum wages, regulate working hours, impose housing standards, or conditions of collective bargaining?

Secretary WICKARD. I think that we, the same as any other agency which is called upon by farmers to get help, will want to know what the pay would be and how much time they will be given work, the percentage of the time that they will be given work; and in a general way, about the housing conditions, before we would ask people to leave one country or one State, and go elsewhere.

Now, what we have done there, is the same as we have done under the sugar-beet law; it was that we said we will establish as far as wages are concerned a certain minimum and also ascertain what the going wage is, and say to these people that we transport, "We will see that you get the minimum or the going wage, whichever is the higher."

As to the amount of time, we have had to say, I believe, that we will give them a pay which will be equal to three-fourths of the working days a week. In other words, 4½ days a week. We will try to see that they have work for that time. Because I think you can see, with people trying to earn a living, it would be very unsatisfactory to them to transport them and then let them stay there 2 or 3 weeks before they were given any work or only given work intermittently.

As to housing conditions, we have never had, so far as I know, any great trouble in satisfying the workers or the people, either about requiring too elaborate housing, or as to the workers, that we have not given them the best that was available. The local people have been very cooperative.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you authority, or is there authority, to require farmers to sign a contract before you deal with them, other than to refuse to give them service unless they do sign a contract?

Secretary WICKARD. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The only authority you have is that you can refuse to give them service unless they do sign a contract?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any authority for requiring them to deposit $5 for each application before you will service it?

Secretary WICKARD. I do not know whether that has been required or not. I suppose that we could say that they could deposit $5 before we would do the work. Do you know whether that is so?

Mr. MAYCOCK. It is my understanding, Mr. Secretary, that that is a requirement to cover the cost of transportation for the first 200 miles, the Department paying the cost over and beyond 200 miles.

COOPERATION WITH LABOR UNIONS IN RECRUITING FARM LABOR

The CHAIRMAN. Have you authority to cooperate with labor unions in recruiting labor and in filling these applications for labor?

Secretary WICKARD. I do not know of any such cooperation. I have heard that Members of Congress have said something about the fact that we have required them to be organized, or something of that kind, but I do not know anything about it. It is not with my authority or with my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you approve of the use of labor unions as recruiting agents in securing farm workers?

Secretary WICKARD. I have never heard of it. I do not know what labor unions you would refer to.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you approve of using labor unions to recruit farm workers?

Secretary WICKARD. Why, I do not know what labor unions we could appeal to. I suppose if they were in a position to furnish us help—are you talking about the C. I. O.?

The CHAIRMAN. We have been told that the Farm Security Administration permits unions to apply the check-off system in connection with workers whom they recruit as farm laborers.

Secretary WICKARD. I do not know that to be true, and I hope we do not get into that sort of thing. Do you know anything about that?

Mr. DARROW. I know nothing about that. A number of large organizations in the country, women's organizations, like the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the International Y. W. C. A., the Business and Professional Women's Club, the A. W. V. S., and, I understand, along with them some of the labor union auxiliaries of women, volunteered to marshal womenfolk in the cities to go out and work on the farms. We think it is a good thing to encourage them to help in recruiting, and have them fit in to whatever the program is, getting in touch with the county agent or the Extension Service. That is the only angle on that I have.

Secretary WICKARD. Have you ever heard of the operation of the check-off system?

Mr. DARROW. No, I do not know anything about it.

Secretary WICKARD. It is news to me.

DEPLETION OF LOCAL LABOR SUPPLY THROUGH RECRUITING ACTIVITIES

The CHAIRMAN. The statement has come to us that you have been recruiting from a thousand to fifteen hundred laborers in Arkansas and Tennessee, with a view of taking them to Florida, when they were needed at home, or at least would be needed in a very short time. What is the policy with regard to taking labor from one State to another, when that will deplete the local labor reservoir?

Secretary WICKARD. I think that would be foolish, if it depleted the local labor reservoir. On the other hand, I think it would be just as foolish to leave a lot of labor in Tennessee and let crops go unplanted or unharvested in Florida, where, as it happens, they are harvesting the citrus fruit and planting the vegetables. And we are recruiting labor for them now. That is what we had in mind in sending to the Bahamas to get men, as quickly as arrangements can be made.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that time is short, and it is imperative to get quick action here. What do you say to the suggestion that it is now too late to organize and establish and train an entirely new organization, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary WICKARD. If we were going to have to organize and train an entirely new organization to take care of labor transportation, and to take care of the camps and all that sort of thing, I think it would seriously delay matters.

May I speak to you off the record at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

(Statement off the record.)

FARM LABOR SITUATION, COOLIDGE, ARIZ.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Secretary, I have here in my hand a memorandum from the Coolidge-Florence Farm Bureau of Coolidge, Ariz. I am going to read a part of it to you, and I am going to ask you to tell me what you think of it.

At the insistence of Federal agencies, our farmers rather reluctantly changed their 1942 crop planting and greatly increased their acreage of American-Egyptian cotton. With this appeal for additional planting came the implication that the Government would see to it that help would be available at picking time.

Its an old story now—familiar to all of you—how this organization and others, as well as many individuals, endeavored to impress the various Government agencies of the coming need and try to secure their cooperation. For a few weeks some progress to this end seemed to be under way; and then came the second phase of discouragement. We found that we not only faced the unavoidable difficulties in the labor situation, but were face to face with an antagonism by some of these very agencies which we had counted on for help—we were stalemated and, in effect, obliged to fight an agency of our own Government. The efforts of the Farm Security Administration to force the hourly wage clause upon us during the 1942 picking season has passed into history. But the determination of the farmers against that sort of domination is not history. It is still very much present and alive.

Because not much has been said about that fiasco during recent weeks, please do not be deceived into thinking that everything worked out all right and the crops were taken care of anyway. Hundreds of acres of unpicked cotton were pastured off, some plowed under, and in many large fields the cotton still hangs untouched by pickers, with the crop stringing to the ground, much gone to the ground, and what remains to be picked will be of a quality so poor as to little more than return the actual picking cost. And all this after months and months of effort to get the reformers and visionaries to be practical and forget their theoretical programs for socialization and "New Deal" experimentation. Whatever—whoever—may have been the "nigger" in that wood pile, it all resulted in disappointment and loss to many of us farmers and the fact is self-evident that hundreds of bales of otherwise valuable long-staple cotton will never be available for flying harness, parachutes, or gliders.

We are not sure that "organized labor" as such had a hand in designing the Farm Security Administration program which proved so useless and unworkable during the last picking season. We only have suspicions. But we are convinced that the leadership of organized labor is definitely self-seeking and selfish and is not working for the best good of all the working class and the best interest of our people as a whole.

There is a lot more of it, but I am not going to take the time to read it now. I should like to have your comment on that.

Mr. RABAUT. Who is that from, Mr. Taber?

Mr. TABER. This is a communication that came to me with the stamp of Congressman Murdock of Arizona on it. It is a letter to Senator Carl Hayden, Senator McFarland, and Representatives John Murdock and Richard Harless, of Arizona, signed by the Coolidge-Florence Farm Bureau, of Coolidge, Ariz. It is signed by three members of a committee.

It is a rather strong indictment of the F. S. A. performances, and I wondered if the Secretary had any comment to make on it.

Secretary WICKARD. I referred a while ago to the controversy we had had concerning the minimum rate in picking the cotton in Arizona, the argument about whether the minimum rate was for every worker or just for the average worker. And, as I said, recently there has been some further discussion of this matter and I hope we can not only work out something satisfactory to them but to the cotton council and other people who have been interested.

Mr. TABER. Do you believe you can do that under the Farm Security Administration?

Secretary WICKARD. As I said, the policy will be decided by me.

Mr. TABER. That would not make any difference when these birds got out into the field, if past experience is anything to go by. They are a law unto themselves when they get swinging.

Secretary WICKARD. Well, I hope I can see to it that policies which have been decided upon are carried out.

OPERATION OF CAMPS BY FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TABER. I would like to read you a couple of telegrams that passed between the Farm Security Administration and a person up in New York State. This telegram is from the farmer:

Can you send me by wire list of privileges Farm Security want for help brought up from the South?

This is the answer from the Farm Security Administration:

Following is a list of privileges promised one man with family of seven: 1,155 gallons of milk; 175 dozen eggs; 50 chickens; 900 pounds of pork; an acre of garden ground; 30 bushels of fruit; 12½ bushels of corn; 22 bushels of wheat; 30 gallons of molasses; and 25 pounds of honey.

A friend of mine, who gave me this information, has figured this up at what I would call very low prices, and it comes to $528 for a starter. What do you think of that?

Secretary WICKARD. I am a little astonished by such figures as that, Congressman Taber. I would like to have the opportunity of knowing who it was or what the circumstances were, because that seems to be rather impractical to me.

Mr. O'NEAL. Who signed that telegram?

Mr. TABER. I cannot give you the name of the signer of the telegram. This came to me from Fred Sexauer, the president of the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association in New York. I would say that he is probably one of the dozen outstanding farmers, and a very forceful person.

Mr. RABAUT. How many people were going to work in that family?

Mr. TABER. One, as I understand it.

Mr. RABAUT. Why do they not hire somebody that has forty children and they would get a bigger bill than that. Such a thing as that is ridiculous.

Secretary WICKARD. I would like to have an opportunity to investigate that. I cannot guarantee or vouch for every action being taken by people in the field, but I never heard, and never even dreamed, that that sort of thing would be taking place.

Mr. TABER. Just as I said before, when these birds get out of your sight, you cannot tell anything about what they will do. If you have had anything to do with this Farm Security Administration you know you cannot control them. I should think that this experience of last year would teach you that.

Why cannot these county agents handle this job, and take care of everything in the locality after these laborers get there?

Secretary WICKARD. I do not think the county agents are equipped to handle labor camps, move a large number of people; they have not had the experience. A lot of these camps that we are going to us are mobile camps.

Mr. TABER. The Farm Security people have not had successful experience.

Secretary WICKARD. I disagree with you. There may have been some instances where they have not been what they should have been, where they have not been satisfactory to me. I am going to admit

that. But on the whole I think the Farm Security Administration had done a very good job in transporting labor. You can ask the people on the west coast.

I remember 2 or 3 years ago all of the criticism that there was concerning the migratory camps out there. Today the people in California, Washington, and Oregon, I was told by one of the Congressmen, would not know what they would do without those camps. At first, as I said, there was criticism. I have looked at those camps and I think those people have done a good job. I am not going to defend every activity and I could not defend what you have just read as a requirement on an employer—I could not do that, of course.

Mr. TABER. I would like to have a reason why these county agents could not look after these camps in the localities.

Secretary WICKARD. Because the camp will be here today and the next day the camp will go some place else, and it will finally go across State lines.

Mr. TABER. How long do they stay in one place?

Secretary WICKARD. Two or three weeks. They would follow the harvesting of the crops.

Mr. TABER. Do you mean that you have a gang from the Farm Security Administration traveling right along with them? How do you operate the set-up? Will you have somebody here tell us, if they know, how you operate a set-up of say 150 workers? How many men do you have who gang along with them?

Secretary WICKARD. I do not believe I can give you the details. I will try and get those for you, for the record, if you wish. But I have been to some of the camps and usually there is a man and a woman. That is all I have seen of these camps.

Mr. TABER. Do they carry women along? Are there women laborers who go along?

Secretary WICKARD. Usually they have families.

Mr. TABER. They move the family right along?

Secretary WICKARD. Usually they have families.

Mr. TABER. Does that apply to these who come in from outside the country?

Secretary WICKARD. No; not from outside the country, up to the present time.

Mr. TABER. Those who are transporting themselves are the ones that have families, is that right?

Secretary WICKARD. They are not transporting themselves. Nowadays they cannot because they have no means of transportation.

The camp that I started to describe to you—for instance I recall one in California. They have tents and they have wooden floors. They have a man who looks after the equipment. That is necessary in a camp because you have certain sanitary provisions that must be observed. Certain order must be preserved in the camp. Usually they have a woman who is a nurse or who has had experience in nursing, who looks after the health of the people, and after the children, things like that, when the mothers are working in the fields.

That is, as nearly as I remember, how the camps are handled, have been handled in the past. That is from my own personal observation. But if you want to get a more complete description, I would like to call on some of our people to submit that for the record.

Mr. TABER. I should think, if you were going to submit this sort of thing to us, that you would know all about it. I should want to, if I were going to submit it.

Secretary WICKARD. I have given you the best description I can give you, Mr. Taber, right now.

Mr. TABER. Very well.

DEFERMENT OF FARM LABOR

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I had a long list of questions which I wanted to ask the Secretary, but I understand the Secretary has to leave soon, and I do not want to deprive other members of the opportunity of asking the Secretary some questions. So I shall make my questions very brief, Mr. Secretary.

You stated awhile ago that a representative of the War Labor Board would be authorized to ask for deferments of farm boys.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; that is, the county war board, the agricultural war board.

Mr. LUDLOW. Have you thought of going a step further and asking for a reexamination of the rolls of the Army and Navy, of the units that are in this country, and nearby stations, with a view of releasing farmers for farm work?

Secretary WICKARD. No, sir; I have not personally advocated that, because it seemed to me, if we could not stop taking the boys from the farm, there was not much hope of taking boys out who had been in and who had been trained.

Mr. LUDLOW. Would not that open up a considerable reservoir of farm labor?

Secretary WICKARD. We have been told by the Army people—we have had discussions on this topic—but they say that they might have 375,000 farm boys in the Army who are still in this country. They cite the fact that they have had difficulty getting men over 38 who can be released to go back to the farms. A lot of them do not like to leave the service. At lot of them say that the pay is going to be less on the farms, when they go back. At lot of them, since they have had some training, perhaps have gotten some advancement; I do not know how much we could do. That is, if we were to do this sort of thing, how many we can get out of 375,000 that they say is in the Army, that might be allowed to go back.

REVISION OF PRICE CEILINGS ON FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Secretary, I heard over the radio last night that the price of hogs was away up yonder, probably the highest it has been at any time since the World War. Do you contemplate in any way a request for a revision of the price ceiling on farm products to the end of increasing the potential ability of the farmers to employ labor?

Secretary WICKARD. Well, farm wages have gone up at least 50 percent during the last 2 years and, perhaps, will continue to go up because of the great demand for farm labor and the deficiency in the supply. I think that, perhaps, the present farm income is the highest on record both gross and net, but there could be some advancement in some areas, such as in the dairy industry, because I

do not think the dairy farmers are making both ends meet in lots of cases. In other cases they are getting the same advantage; $16 is a very good price for hogs compared with the price of grain.

Mr. LUDLOW. There is no immediate prospect of asking for an increase in the price ceilings on farm products as a means of meeting this farm labor problem?

Secretary WICKARD. No; I do not think we could increase them enough to compete with Allison, for instance, at Indianapolis, with the wage scale there. Do you think we could?

Mr. LUDLOW. No; I do not.

MECHANIZATION OF FARMS

Mr. LUDLOW. There are one or two additional questions that I would like to ask the Secretary, and one of them is with reference to mechanized farming. A great deal of the really productive farming in the country is mechanized. Is there any way of getting an arrangement made whereby you can get new tractors and new combines for the farmers when the ones they now have wear out?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir; we are in negotiation with the War Production Board, not only for more steel for the manufacture of farm machinery, but for a definite schedule of delivery. In other words, it is not the amount of steel you get, it is when you get it, to see that it is delivered in time for planting the crop and for cultivating the crop and for harvesting the crop.

To be quite frank with you we have failed to get the amount of steel that we ought to have to make the machinery for this spring's planting. You cannot at this time make machinery for this spring's planting and get it to the farmer in time for use for that purpose. I am pressing on that in order to get the farm machinery for this year, and we are also working on next year's program because we must get the latter part of this year the steel allocated for next year's program. I presented to the War Production Board on Wednesday of this week an outline of the program which calls for a large amount of steel over the amount we have had.

You must remember that we are asking the farmers for more and more production all the time, and when they have less labor they cannot get along with less machinery, but require more machinery. One thing must be remembered, and that is that we have the highest output per worker in this country of any country in the world, and you cannot expect people to get along without machinery because it is through the use of machinery in this country that we have had this great output per worker.

FEASIBILITY OF REDUCING APPROPRIATION

Mr. LUDLOW. I would like to ask you this question, Mr. Secretary, for my own enlightenment: These estimates that you are presenting here and your presentation seems to be based on this total of $65,000,000. This is an unknown field and an unknown operation. Do you think it would be feasible to start out with a smaller appropriation than that, and then when you find your bearings come back here for a deficiency if you need additional funds?

Secretary WICKARD. I think the Bureau of the Budget itself was instrumental, with our people, in preparing it, and is satisfied that this is the amount we ought to have for this purpose.

On the question of agriculture, you know, you just cannot be too late, because to be too late is never. That is the thing that worries me, and if we do not get the help that we have to have in order to plant these crops this spring 1 year is gone forever, and I do not know how long I have been pressing for this sort of thing, but still I have not gotten through the first committee yet.

Mr. LUDLOW. In asking that question I have no thought of an inadequate appropriation. It was just my thought that while you were feeling your way you might start off in a more moderate way, and then, finding your way, you could proceed through a deficiency appropriation if more money was needed. There is no thought of curtailing your requirements, Mr. Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Snyder.

MARKETING OF YOUNG CALVES

Mr. SNYDER. I have one or two brief questions. Is the slaughter permitted of veal calves which are 6, 8, or 10 weeks old now?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Is there any way to stop that, and should that not be stopped?

Secretary WICKARD. No, I do not thinks so, because a lot of these calves do not make good beef and they are not efficient users of feed in producing meat. If they were good breeding stock from dairy herds I wish we could stop it, and we are trying to work out ways of keeping those for milk cows, but I have great question in my mind as to whether you would want to take a Jersey calf and try to make a meat animal out of it. I do not think the chairman of the committee would think that would be a very good use of feed, labor, or shelter.

BUTCHERING OF DAIRY STOCK

Mr. SNYDER. I have another question, and, of course, I imagine most of it is newspaper talk, but I hear stories like this, that this man out here had a herd of so many cattle in a dairy and he is selling them all off, or he is butchering them because he cannot get good help, or for this, that, or the other reason. Has that gone on to any extent?

Secretary WICKARD. We have had a lot of reports about forced sales of dairy stock, but the number of milk cows on our farms today is the largest on record.

Our investigations show that most of those forced sales, or most of the cattle involved in those forced sales have been bought by other farmers, but to be sure that there are none of those animals going to slaughter that could be kept in milk production we are putting in effect a program, and it has been in effect for some time in your State, in particular, whereby we offer to buy cows of proven merit and transfer them to people who do not have enough cows, but who do have the labor with which to carry on dairy production. We have had several instances in your State where we have done that. We have found a rather ready sale for these animals, but we do not want to buy a lot

of cows that are not efficient in milk production, worn-out cows, diseased cows, or cows with bad udders, or something of that kind.

Mr. SNYDER. I think that is a very vital field for you to look into as a whole over the Nation so that they do not kill off or butcher these good milk-producing cows.

Secretary WICKARD. We are shorter on dairy production from the standpoint of our needs than we are of anything else, and I will say this, that the dairy farmer is having harder going than anybody else.

Mr. SNYDER. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. O'Neal.

SECRETARY'S REPLY TO CRITICISM

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I know that the time is very short but I hope this can be done. The Secretary has made definite recommendations as to how this job should be done. Those recommendations have been questioned by farm organizations who have presented their objections in a definite printed way. I was wondering if we could have this done, that the Secretary might, by way of rebuttal answer those criticisms and let us see if they have any meeting of the minds on part of the problem, and then as to the part they are not agreed on this committee would have to make the decision. They have come here with a written record that challenges the recommendations that the Secretary first made.

I think if we could have the Secretary's categorical reply to those criticisms it would be helpful in determining what we ought to do. So, I will not ask a lot of questions concerning their objections.

I do not know whether that would be agreeable to the chairman or to the committee, but I certainly believe that if we could have the categorical answer of the Secretary to their criticisms it might be helpful in assisting us in arriving at the right conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The record will be submitted to the Secretary.

DEFERMENT OF FARM LABOR

Mr. O'NEAL. I understand you to say, Mr. Secretary, that there has been a request for deferment of every young man living on a farm. Is that correct?

Secretary WICKARD. What has happened is that we have, with the Selective Service, and with the Special Committee appointed by the Senate, drawn up a scale by which we judge whether a man is essential to agriculture or essential to production.

Mr. O'NEAL. It does not mean that every young man living on a farm would be exempted from military service?

Secretary WICKARD. May I finish?

Mr. O'NEAL. I thought you had finished.

Secretary WICKARD. We are now facing the planting season, and I have asked General Hershey not to take any more boys from the farms, those who have been on farms, who have shown a willingness to work on farms until we see whether they are producing enough to justify keeping them on the farm, but we are not asking them to keep everybody on the farms.

Mr. O'NEAL. What about young men on submarginal farms where they are making no real contribution to the solution of the food problem?

Secretary WICKARD. That is an instance of those that we are not trying to keep there.

Mr. O'NEAL. I thought you said that they were universally deferred?

Secretary WICKARD. Just for 30 days. I asked that they be deferred until after the planting season, and I believe General Hershey sent out word that it would be for 30 days.

Mr. DARROW. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rabaut.

COST OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. O'Neal asked this question about deferring farm labor that I was going to ask you. So, I will not ask it. But you said something about a $5 fee for farmers who signed a contract?

Secretary WICKARD. I said every farmer who was a party to a contract had to put up $5.

Mr. WEBSTER. The $5 is to cover the cost of transportation for the first 200 miles.

Secretary WICKARD. You see, the farmer furnishes the transportation up to 200 miles, and we furnish it after that.

Mr. RABAUT. He furnishes the transportation for the labor within a distance of 200 miles?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, he pays for the transportation himself up to 200 miles. That would be desirable as showing his interest in getting that help.

Mr. RABAUT. His interest in getting these people to work for him.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Johnson.

COOPERATIVE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Secretary, have you seen those proposed contracts personally; have you carefully gone over them, and if so have you approved them?

Secretary WICKARD. I do not believe I have gone over the Farm Security contract in detail. I did go over the agreement with Mexico, and I was told that these contracts were in conformity with this, but I cannot say I have studied them carefully. I think that is one of the things we want to look into.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have before me Form FSA–502, August 31, 1942, and it has terms *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e*, *f*, *g*, *h*, and so forth. There is a long list of requirements that the employer agrees to in this contract, but I fail to find one word in it which gives any protection to the farmer, whether he be the owner of the farm or a tenant farmer. It promises every protection imaginable for the migrant laborer who might work temporarily on the farm.

I wonder if you would be good enough to tell the committee whose brain child this contract is?

Secretary WICKARD. If that has "F. S. A." on it, it was prepared in the Farm Security Administration.

FARM WAGES, HOURS OF WORK, HOUSING, AND SO FORTH

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Earlier in this hearing you answered a question by the chairman as to your authority to require a farmer to

sign such contracts. Do you have any authority to require him, in case there is a controversy or misunderstanding, to submit the matter to a board of arbitration, and do you personally favor such procedure?

Secretary WICKARD. Well, of course, any time a farmer feels like a man who is working for him is not doing his full day's work, or anything like that, I suppose he would have the right to bring complaint. I do not know just whether this board of arbitration that you refer to has a mandate for this or not, but I suppose they would try somehow to find out what would be the right thing to do. You cannot expect a farmer to just keep on asking for a new man every day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Do you not think the farmer who owns the land or the tenant farmer who tills it and who is eking out a bare living, should have a right to decide whether a farm hand is satisfactory to him? Do you believe he should be required to submit any little difference of opinion to a board of arbitration, just like an industrial dispute is now handled? Are you, Mr. Secretary, trying to industrialize the farmer or regiment him, while asking him to materially increase his production?

Secretary WICKARD. Well, Mr. Johnson, I am not too familiar with what you refer to about arbitration. I suppose there may be instances, as I have said, where there might be some dispute and this man says I want somebody else, and there ought to be some way to find out what the trouble is. Or, maybe the man who is doing the work might feel he was not given the right treatment, and that somebody should look into it. I suppose that is the purpose of the board to which you refer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. So much for that. You have expressed deep concern about the plight of dairy farmers?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. You say that the problem of the dairy farmer is a most critical one, yet it is provided in this contract we are discussing and which your Department has approved, that no farmer may require a worker to work on Sunday. And, of course, Mr. Secretary, you know that a dairy farmer must take care of his herd, and that they must be milked on Sundays. There is not a word in this contract to protect him. In fact, it provides that he cannot under any circumstances require the farm worker to do any labor on Sunday. Do you approve of that?

Secretary WICKARD. No; I do not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I did not think you would. That's why I asked if you had personally examined it. But that isn't the only objectionable and impractical feature of your contract. Subparagraph (j) in this contract provides:

"The workers shall be entitled to freedom from discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin in accordance with the provisions of Executive order" number so and so.

Does that mean, Mr. Secretary, that in case a farmer has been permitting a neighbor's boy who is working for him to eat at his table with his family and sleep in his bed, that these Bahamans, or workers from Mexico or Africa, or other places, should be extended exactly the same social privilege? Mr. Secretary, please tell the committee, is that what subparagraph J really means?

Secretary WICKARD. I am not sure it does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Do you approve of that?

Secretary WICKARD. I am not sure what the application of that may be. The President has issued an Executive order prohibiting discrimination in employment of workers. I suppose it means as to working conditions that a Mexican or a Bahaman would be given the same pay as anybody else.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, if your proposed contract referred only to wages that is one thing. But the terms of the contract go much further. It makes it plain that the farmer has no discretion. It is mandatory that he treat all farm workers exactly alike, in all respects. That just won't work in Oklahoma.

Secretary WICKARD. I question whether there are any of these people who are transported under this contract who are ever billeted with the farmer, not that I know of, at least, because they put them in camps, in larger groups, and I do not believe these questions you raise would actually come up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Then let's have the record clear that you are not trying to socialize the transient farm worker or force impossible conditions on the farmers of America.

RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN CROPS

Now, Mr. Secretary, you spoke of a threatened shortage of food. I think every member of this Committee realizes that that is a serious problem, because we are giving away a tremendous amount of food to our allies. And we might as well tell the truth about it. There is no use of camouflaging the real facts. We are not short of food as far as our own people are concerned. We all know that we are giving away a lot of food, and rightly so, to our allies, and because of that, and the fact that we must make certain that our armed forces must be well fed, we are facing a food shortage.

Mr. Secretary, a lot has been said on the floor of Congress and in the press about the Department of Agriculture paying people not to grow certain crops, including sugar beets in California and Colorado. That story is so old that it has whiskers. Please tell the committee if there is any truth in these reports: Are you now paying any farmers anywhere not to produce sugar beets and if not how long has it been since the Department has done so?

Secretary WICKARD. There has been no practice in the Department of Agriculture for the last 2 years of paying people not to grow beets. We are doing everything we can to encourage them to grow beets.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Secretary, if you will examine the Congressional Record you will find it has not been 10 days since some Member arose on the floor of the House and declared that the Department is still paying people not to grow sugar beets in California and Colorado while our people are being rationed on sugar. Then you say to the committee that there is no truth in that oft-repeated charge?

Secretary WICKARD. That is incorrect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am glad to have you clear that up.

Secretary WICKARD. The only crops, as you well know, that we are today in any way restricting are cotton and tobacco.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Secretary, I am glad you made that statement also as there are a great many people who are ordi-

narily well informed who have an idea that many crops are being restricted. You are certain, Mr. Secretary, that cotton and tobacco are the only two crops that are in any way restricted?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And do you propose to continue to restrict cotton as well as tobacco?

Secretary WICKARD. That is the plan; yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Just what are you doing with reference to cotton? Are you asking the farmers to grow the full 27,000,000 acres of cotton this year as you did last season?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Last year, I am sure you will recall, you issued a statement calling on the cotton farmers to grow 27,000,000 acres of cotton, and then when the droughts, and the floods, the boll weevil, and the duststorms cut down that acreage to about 22,000,000 acres, I am sure you also remember that I called on you and reminded you that we were at war, and despite the surplus of cotton that unless we had an exceptionally good crop we might be faced with a shortage of cotton before this war is over. Evidently you were not much disturbed then about a shortage of any crops as you are now. Except for the fact that we had an exceptionally good cotton crop there would have been a real shortage.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; we had a very good crop last year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. While there was quite a carry-over, we are using considerable more cotton than we use in peacetime, is that not correct?

Secretary WICKARD. We are using more cotton today than ever before in this country, not exporting it, but using it in this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And despite the fact that we are using much more cotton in the war effort, directly and indirectly, you plan to continue restricting cotton and tobacco?

Secretary WICKARD. That is right, and those are the only crops we are restricting. It is largely a question of what we should do with our fertilizer and our labor and our land. Should we use it for the increased production of these crops when we need other crops more? That is the question that is involved, Mr. Johnson.

PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me express the hope, Mr. Secretary, that you will see fit to increase the maximum acreage from 27,000,000 to say 31 or 32 million acres. Even then, if history repeats itself there would be actually grown and picked not in excess of the 27,000,000 acres you say is needed. Mr. Secretary, I understood you to say in reply to a question asked by the gentleman from Indiana, that the price of hogs is too high.

Secretary WICKARD. I am a hog raiser, so I think I can say this, I think they are too high, or, rather, I would put it this way, I do not think the price has to be this high according to feed prices. Sixteen dollars, I think, is out of line with the price of feed. I am very happy to see that big increase in production, and we have had that increase because the prices have been favorable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. What about the prices of other farm commodities, such as cotton, corn, wheat, and oats, hay, and so forth;

do you think they are too high, considering the wages the farmers must pay as well as the prices he must pay for everything he buys?

Secretary WICKARD. I think that the cotton producers are getting very good returns for their crop. I think the corn producers, and I am a corn producer, I think for the producer that those present prices are very satisfactory. I do not think the dairy prices are satisfactory.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. What about 14-cent milk and 60-cent butter, the price we must pay here in Washington?

Secretary WICKARD. Well, it is high enough, perhaps, for the consumer to pay, but I do not think the dairy farmer is getting what he ought to have to meet his costs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. With that I agree, but there seems to be quite a differential between what the dairy farmer is receiving and the exorbitant price the consumer is paying in some sections. Is there anything being done to improve that situation?

Secretary WICKARD. In the fluid milk markets where we have agreements we are trying to work out some economies.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Now, what about your soil conservation practice; do you plan to continue that?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Both the Soil Conservation Service and the soil-conservation practices?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, the conservation service certainly should be continued and expanded in the post war program.

Now, just one more question. You mentioned something about your agreements for transient labor from Mexico and you discussed them off the record. Possibly we should discuss the details off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will you, now for the record, Mr. Secretary, give for the benefit of the committee the high spots or the essentials of the agreement that you have made with Mexico?

Secretary WICKARD. We agreed to transport these people to and from Mexico. We agreed to a certain minimum wage, which is $3 a day, or the going rate, whichever is higher. We agreed that we would keep out a certain reserve to be held for the Mexicans when the returned. We agreed to give them work for three-quarters of the working days while they were here. We agreed to give them the housing conditions that were available in the community where they were working. We also had an agreement with them that these men were not to leave agriculture and go into other industry, that if they did they were to return to Mexico immediately, and the Mexican Government was as insistent about that as we were, because they have had some very unsatisfactory experiences about people being left up here stranded.

I think that is about the main part of the agreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. You did not agree with them that there was to be an arbitration board and that any time these Mexican

laborers did not like the treatment that they were getting that they could run to some Arbitration board and force the farmer to pay them higher prices?

Secretary WICKARD. They could not force the farmer to pay them higher prices, because the wages were not set by the farmer or by the laborer either one. We did have a board which established the going wage in California, for instance. We have done that in sugar beets, and we are doing it under this agreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Then there is an agreement that they were to have what you call the going wage?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir; to be established by a group of representative people in the State.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman concluded?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wigglesworth.

FORMS FSA 500 AND 502

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Secretary, I wish you would furnish for the record the name of the person who is responsible for these two agreements that Mr. Johnson has been referring to. You have the numbers there, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Form FSA–502.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is the one, and the other one is form FSA–500?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; form FSA–500 and 502.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I would like to know who drafted those agreements, and what approval, if any, they have had up to this time; that is, who has approved them, if anybody.

Secretary WICKARD. We will furnish that for the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

FORMS FSA–500 AND FSA–502

The drafting of these forms was a joint undertaking by the Farm Security Administration and the Solicitor's Office. A number of different people worked on them, or parts of them. It could not be said that any particular person drafted them. They were so written that domestic laborers would be provided the same benefits as Mexican laborers under the agreement we have with Mexico. The forms are subject to modification based on local conditions and situations. Maj. John O. Walker, former Assistant Administrator of Farm Security Administration approved the forms.

FARM LABOR CAMPS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Who determined that you needed 345 camps to do this job?

Secretary WICKARD. Mr. Maycock, do you know how those determinations were made? There was quite a long study carried on by the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget in regard to that.

Mr. MAYCOCK. Mr. Wigglesworth, based upon our experience in estimating the number of laborers for whom we were asking funds to transport, it was estimated that some farmers would already have housing facilities available to house these workers, but that in many of the localities there would be no such facilities available. Therefore, for a number of them in certain locations we estimated that

farm labor centers or camps would have to be constructed, which is the number and amount as shown in our estimate.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Who made the determination, or on what basis was it made? A reasonable number does not mean anything very definite.

Mr. MAYCOCK. The original estimate was made by the Farm Security Administration, the people who have the responsibility for carrying out this part of the program, as we are now operating it under the President's emergency fund.

The estimate that was submitted to the Department, as I recall it, by the Farm Security Administration was larger in the first instance, and the Secretary's office in reviewing it cut it somewhat from the number originally estimated, so that the Secretary's office participated in this determination.

From there the estimate went to the Bureau of the Budget and the amount that is before you gentlemen now is the amount which the President, after recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget, approved as what would be the reasonable number of units required in order to house certain of these people who are being transported.

Secretary WICKARD. Did not the War Manpower Commission participate in it also?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Yes, sir; the War Manpower Commission concurred in this estimate.

Secretary WICKARD. You see, we are operating under their direction on all of this sort of thing.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand, but you were unable to tell Mr. Taber, in practical terms, how any one of these camps operated, and I wondered who had made the determination of the number of camps necessary under those conditions, and on what basis the determination had been made.

OVER-ALL ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

Who arrived at this figure on the number of personnel that you may need? According to my arithmetic here it mounts up to something like 3,447 for the 6 projects you have outlined. Who is responsible for the determination of the number of personnel that you think you need?

Mr. MAYCOCK. The original estimates on the first two projects, that is, transportation and housing, were, as I have said, made by the Farm Security Administration people.

On project No. 3, which is for the Extension Service, the original estimates were made by the Extension Service.

As to project No. 4, the investigation of farm wage rates, that original estimate was made, and the amount was different in the original estimate, I might say, by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

For project No. 5, farm job simplification, the original estimate was made by the Office of Personnel of the Secretary's office. A group which the Secretary looked to for assistance in the administration of the program—Major Walker was in charge at the time—made the original estimate on project 6, which is for administration.

All of the estimates, as stated in connection with project No. 2, were reviewed by the Office of Budget and Finance, a part of the Secretary's office at the departmental level. Changes were made in the

original estimates submitted, and there were reductions in practically every instance. From there they went to the Bureau of the Budget, and revisions were made in the Bureau of the Budget.

So that, the Secretary's office at the departmental level participated in these determinations, as did the Bureau of the Budget, before the President submitted them to the Congress.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Now, Mr. Secretary, you have stated to Mr. Taber that you have given him the best picture you can in regard to project No. 2, that is as to the work camp centers.

ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES IN TRANSPORTATION OF FARM LABOR

Can you give us any better picture of project 1, the transportation project in respect of which you are asking for 1,038 employees at $1,400,000 plus, as well as over $25,000,000 worth of other obligations? Can you give us in simple, concrete terms just how that transportation problem is going to be handled? What is the function that calls for 1,038 people?

Secretary WICKARD. Well, as you know, we have been transporting several thousand of these people, and the estimate, I am sure, is based upon the best experience of estimated needs.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What does that work involve? I do not visualize it. You say you have been transporting these people. What have you been doing actually?

Secretary WICKARD. In Mexico we carry on an examination of every application down there. I think we have only taken about one out of every five applicants. We are trying to get people who are not only physically able to work, but who are inclined to work on farms, and would be satisfied to work on farms, and they are transported to California, for instance, across the border.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What do you do in connection with their transportation? The railroad transports them, does it not?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What does the Farm Security Administration do under the heading transportation that requires all of this personnel and all of this expenditure? I want to get the detailed picture of it if I can.

Secretary WICKARD. Well, I shall attempt to do that. After these people are recruited they have to be put on trains and brought here. I think you understand when you transport soldiers or workers you have to provide some sort of supervision for them, and then they are taken to the places where they are to work, and housing is found for them, and work is found for them.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes, but that comes under the camp centers, does it not? I am talking about project 1 now, transportation.

Secretary WICKARD. Mr. Maycock, will you explain the difference? You do not, I hope, Mr. Wigglesworth, expect me to be familiar with every one of these items; I have several other duties in the Department of Agriculture to perform in addition to these.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I know you have, Mr. Secretary, but I should suppose that, on a matter of this importance, you would have the details at your fingertips in coming before a congressional committee to justify a request for an appropriation.

Secretary WICKARD. I think Mr. Maycock can answer those questions, but I do not know just what every man does in detail.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understood you endorsed both the amount and the set-up which is before us this morning. In order to do that I assumed that you would have the details in contemplation in mind.

Secretary WICKARD. Will you explain that, Mr. Maycock?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Naturally, Mr. Wigglesworth, the Secretary had to rely on the recommendations of his staff, which has worked on the estimate and developed the program. He could not participate in every detail of it due to the many important policy-making matters that he has to consider and decide upon. Therefore, some of the rest of us must take responsibility for the details.

The number of employees that have been asked for under the farm labor transportation project are those we consider necessary, from the experience we have had to date, in recruiting people under the President's emergency fund.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Which involves what?

Mr. MAYCOCK. That involves, in the first place, receiving certifications as to the need for workers in certain particular areas. Up to the time this estimate was prepared those certifications had been made by the United States Employment Service. Then a determination must be made as to the logical places to get these workers from that need to be transported, where there are surplus labor areas at the moment, those in closest proximity to cut the cost of transportation down, and yet where the workers would be able, because of their past experience, to perform that work that is needed at a particular place.

Assistance has been given in the past by the United States Employment Service in actually going out and recruiting workers in Mexico as well as in the continental United States. They have to be assembled, they have to be told how much household goods they can bring with them, and they have to have explained to them the terms of the agreement which is to be entered into, so that they know the conditions and the basis, such as wages and housing facilities, under which they are going to work.

They have many questions to ask, and it takes a considerable number of personnel, at the moment, to get several hundred workers together in order to transport them. It is also contemplated that they will be given physical examinations, so that expense will not be incurred in transporting those who are physically incompetent to do farm labor.

Then, when they are put on the train the job is not done. The railroad does not always take care of them from then on. If it is any kind of a trip at all, depending on the circumstances, these people have to be fed. Sometimes they are given box lunches. Sometimes they will be fed on the diner at the rate that the Government pays for the troops. Other times they have to take stop-overs and get them fed at eating facilities along the way, so a small number, if there are several hundred being transported, has to accompany them on this trip, and after they reach their destination means have to be employed to get them to the particular locality to which they are going. If it is a farm labor center that they are going to, at that point the work is taken over and supervision is given to them by the men who are employed under the farm labor center project.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Do you feed them with spoons?

Mr. MAYCOCK. In the box lunches they have paper spoons if necessary. When they eat on the trains, naturally they are furnished utensils, or when they eat at restaurants along the way they are furnished with utensils.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think that is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lambertson.

IMPRACTABILITY OF PROGRAM

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I am not going to ask any questions, but I want to say this: I do not know how these fellows are going to help the farmers when they get there unless each one of them has an interpreter accompanying him, so that the farmer can talk with him.

I am ont of sympathy with the whole program, to be honest with, you. Farm labor is not expensive labor, but it is rare labor, and city labor does not function on farms unless they were on farms before they went to the city.

If they do not give us back some of the boys that they took from us that they should not have taken, and if they do not give us a longer workweek we are hopeless, there is no hope in this program, no comprehensive hope. If there is anything that the farmer is going to resent he is going to resent these social gains, scales, and standards. He is going to utterly resent it, and he does not want to have anything to do with it. He would rather take his chances and do the work that he can do with the help of the Federal agency, and we already have a Federal agency on employment which has been extended largely.

The Extension Service is already aiding in each of the States and cooperating with patriotic organizations in all of the communities.

For small farms it is impractical to bring labor in from a distance of more than 200 miles to help the farmers to take the place of the young men who have left the farms. I do not think it is a practical plan, and I think it will be resented by the farmers. I do not think it is going to be worth the money. That is my personal thought about the whole thing. My thought is we either have to get some of these boys out of the Army, or else lower these inducements which have taken them away from us and put them into defense factories. That is our only hope for farm labor. It is not a part of this farm labor program which is before us, and it will just be money thrown away.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION FORMS 502 AND 503

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ditter.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Johnson, my friend from Oklahoma, directed your attention to this contract. The ultimate responsibility for that contract is yours, is it not?

Secretary WICKARD. I think it was approved by my office.

Mr. WEBSTER. Yes, our solicitor passed on it.

Secretary WICKARD. It is my responsibility; yes, sir.

Mr. DITTER. So that whatever observations my friend from Oklahoma made with reference to the contract have your quasi-indorsement, insofar as the content of the agreement goes, does it not?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. Would you say that the motive or objective in the drawing of the farm problem, or was the motive in it the continued imposition of social objectives on the farmer?

Secretary WICKARD. Well, you know as well as I do that all of the people who are going to work on farms this year very probably could get work under more satisfactory conditions at higher wages someplace else. Now, if we tell them when we ask them to work on farms that we cannot give them any standards and that we cannot give them any guaranties, that they will just have to shift for themselves, I do not think we are going to be able to get very many people to work on farms. I would not even want to try to get people to work on farms under those uncertain conditions.

Mr. DITTER. I represent a farming country. In a part of my district I have a very beautiful countryside, and I want you to tell me what I shall tell my farmers they are to do with their cows on Sunday if they employ help on their farms. Are they to dry them up, or are they to put an alarm clock on them on Saturday night? Tell me just what I am to tell my farmers. Getting away from all of the philosophy of it, you know, and all of the rest of it, I just want a practical answer as to what I am to tell some of my farmers what they are to do with their cows on Sunday. Many of these farmers are Mennonites, Amish, and Dunkers, and they know how to farm pretty well, and they have been farming for many years, and also their cows have been giving milk on Sunday. They also go to church on Sunday, and I just want to be able to tell those plain folks. They probably do not understand much about these mixed theories, probably, or much about these advanced social philosophies, but they are awfully plain, good people, and I would just like to have you tell me so that I can tell them.

Secretary WICKARD. Well, Congressman, I do not think we are going to transport any Bahamans here to milk cows.

Mr. DITTER. We are short of farm help up there. We are selling some of the dairy herds up there. You told Mr. Snyder a moment ago that some of my folks are selling their dairy herds, and you are buying them.

I know they have been working more than 8 hours a day and more than 6 days a week. I have pitched hay occasionally, and I have had to bring it in on Sundays sometimes, bless your heart, when it had to be gotten in.

Now, I do not want any of the fancy phrasing, and I do not want any of the highfalootin language, and I do not want anything about star gazing. All I want to know from you is what I am to tell my plain people up there who worship God on Sunday, and work hard the rest of the week?

Secretary WICKARD. May I proceed, or are you still talking?

Mr. DITTER. I might break in on you if you go too far in your socialized philosophizing; go ahead.

Secretary WICKARD. I have tried to tell you kindly that we are not transporting people across State lines in large numbers under this type of contract at the present time to work on dairy farms.

It is my hope that we can use the Extension Service to obtain people to work on dairy farms in Pennsylvania, or in other States.

I want to make it plain that this contract only refers to people who are transported in the vegetable or citrus fruit fields, or in the cotton fields, and in sugar-beet fields.

Now, that was why, I guess, there was a stipulation in there that they should not be required to work on Sunday, though many of course will have no objections and some will even wish to in order to receive the additional wages. What I think we are saying is that we should not force people to work on Sunday, because I am sure, and I have quite a number of Mennonites, Dunkers, and Amish in my country, that they do not work in their fields on Sunday either.

Mr. DITTER. Have you finished?

Secretary WICKARD. I have.

Mr. DITTER. They might not work in their fields on Sunday, but I want to tell you that they do their chores on the farm on Sunday, because I live among them, and they milk their cows on Sunday.

If you do not intend to have that apply to dairy farmers, how are you going to reconcile the fact that here is one man whom you employ on this contract to do work on one certain kind of a farm and he does not have to work on Sunday, and here is another man who does have to work on Sunday? How are you going to reconcile his status with the status of the fellow who does have to work on Sunday? Is that not going to cause discontent? Farmer A does not have a dairy farm, and his men only work 6 days a week, and they have Sunday off for sport, and farmer B has a dairy farm, and his workers have to work on Sunday. Is that not going to cause some conflicts and discontent?

The CHAIRMAN. May I suggest that the Secretary is here to answer broad questions of policy, and not questions on matters of detail. Now, he has answered that question at least six times for three or four members of the committee, and I believe that is enough.

Mr. DITTER. Do not cut me off, Mr. Chairman. I want to have the benefit of the profound utterances of the Secretary. I am very much interested in trying to seek some light on some phases of it about which I am confused.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the fact that the staff of the Secretary is here to answer detailed questions, and he is here only to answer on broad questions of policy, I suggest that you ask them those questions.

Mr. DITTER. The confusion on this becomes worse confounded. I am somewhat confused, and I am trying to find some light.

ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL IN TRANSPORTATION OF FARM LABOR

How many guardians do you need for every 200 folks to tell them where to eat, and where to get off of the train; what is the ratio of transportation assistants to the number of folks that you do transport—well, I will withhold that question for those other men. I want to conform to your wishes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Just as the gentleman prefers.

Mr. DITTER. No; you will find me a most agreeable individual, because you are the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman concluded?

Mr. DITTER. You have indicated that you want the Secretary excused, and I will bow to your wishes.

The CHAIRMAN. No; I am not indicating that. The Secretary will be glad to answer any questions the gentleman desires to ask on broad questions of policy.

Mr. DITTER. I was intrigued by the very practical approach of my friend from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. We will excuse the Secretary.

PROPOSED PROCEDURE OF AGRICULTURAL LABOR ADMINISTRATION

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Darrow, you will be in charge of this work. I wish you would give us a brief résumé of the set-up that you expect to establish, both here in Washington and out in the field and the routine that you expect to follow in carrying out the duties of your office.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I have been on the job 4 days, so I have not had an opportunity to work it all out, but I can tell you in general the trend we want to follow, and that is the utilization of the existing facilities of the Department and the agencies of the Department to the full in order to get a unified, coordinated attack on this farm labor shortage.

There is no idea of setting up another agency to go out and get the job done. I do not think it is necessary to do that. I think we should use the Extension Service, the F. S. A., and any other parts of the Department interested in this problem, and especially that we should work with those agencies, and with the organized groups of the country.

That is, I think that this is a problem in which you need to mobilize the local initiative, and the local efforts of all kinds of groups: civic groups, women's groups, farm organizations, and people who are willing to and who want to help to get this thing done. It is a job for all of us, and so I see the job here that the Secretary has entrusted to me as being one of acting under his direction to bring about a centralization of policy making and procedures, to help all of these agencies in the Department, and to work with these other organizations to get the job done.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ludlow.

Mr. LUDLOW. The backbone of this organization to secure farm labor is going to be the Farm Extension Service, as I understand it. I would like to have some explanation as to these unusual allocations in this appropriation. Only $6,000,000 is given to the Farm Extension Service, and some $40,000,000 is given to the Farm Security Administration. What is it that causes that disparity of allocation here?

Mr. DARROW. I am not an expert on the Budget, but, in general, I think I can answer your question.

This labor problem, as I see it, divides, roughly, into big parts, one of which is seasonal labor, and the other is getting full-year-round labor.

Now, we want, in getting either kind of labor, to get it locally just as far as possible, and probably when you add your figures up they would run about 90 percent of the total.

Mr. LUDLOW. That comes within the purview of the Extension Service?

Mr. DARROW. Yes; but the expensive part, it seems to me, is this one where you have to go off somewhere else to recruit labor and then to move them, and provide camps to house them in, and all of that sort of thing, so that you get a disproportionately high part of it going into that, and it is that last 10 percent of imported labor that I believe the farmers want very badly in these critical areas.

Mr. LUDLOW. What is the relative personnel as between the Extension Service and the Farm Security Administration in this operation?

Mr. DARROW. I do not know.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Snyder.

UTILIZATION OF EXTENSION SERVICE

Mr. SNYDER. I think that Mr. Wilson will answer this question. One of the State extension agents before the committee presented a rather workable program as to his State. It would seem so from what he said. He enumerated the different agencies, perhaps 11 or 12 State agencies and cooperative organizations of different kinds, including the Farm Security Administration and the A. A. A. Now, in what way would this federally headed organization or the Secretary's organization here interfere with him in carrying out his program as he might have presented it yesterday?

Mr. WILSON. I am not just sure what his program was, but the Secretary has assumed that in this operation the Extension Service will be made responsible for certain things. I might read from a memorandum to the Extension Service from the Secretary on that point.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; I wish you would do that.

Mr. WILSON. Reading from that memorandum, the Secretary says:

Specifically, I am requesting the Cooperative Extension Service of the Department and the State extension services to be responsible for—

1. Direction of the complete mobilization and effective placement and utilization of all local farm labor resources available in rural areas, including the labor resources of every town, village, and small city in every agricultural county in the United States in order to insure the full productive use of all such labor within the county for farm work. Appropriate use should be made of the facilities of the United States Employment Service, of the War Manpower Commission, and defense councils of the Office of Civilian Defense where they are in a position to help with this program.

Mr. SNYDER. That means that the State extension director should make use of all of these agencies?

Mr. WILSON. In the county; yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir; talking about the counties.

2. Organization and management, in cooperation with the Office of Education and the public schools, of a Nation-wide program for the recruitment and use of nonfarm youth of high school and college age for practical summer-period and crop-season work on farms.

Those are the schools.

3. Development and supervision of a program for the organized recruitment and utilization of nonfarm women for appropriate types of farm work wherever practicable; also for cooperation with and rendering appropriate assistance to other groups sponsoring and organizing activities along these lines.

4. Conducting a continuous educational drive to assist farmers in making the most efficient possible use of both the skilled labor now on farms and the inexperienced labor which will be engaging in farm work for the first time.

Now, those are the specific things which I think the Secretary is looking to the Extension Service to perform.

It is my personal judgment that the Extension Service, being an educational organization, and being a part of the educational service of the land-grant colleges, is well adapted to carry out the above kind of service I have just read. When it gets over into the administrative and regulatory field as applied to migratory laborers, the operation of labor camps, service to the Mexican laborers, and the adjudication of disputes, and so forth, which come up in connection with wage rates and working conditions, it is not wise for the Extension Service to undertake these. Of course, there activities apply primarily to the fruit, vegetable, and sugar-beet industries. That is where the migratory labor enters into the problem. The organization of the Extension Service, because of its background and the kind of personnel it has, is not equipped for regulatory and administrative service and that sort of thing.

Mr. SNYDER. I would judge, then, that at least 90 percent of all of the work done in a State like Pennsylvania, with reference to rounding up help and cooperating with the farmers and getting employees out there, at least 90 percent of it would be done through the extension agency of that State?

Mr. WILSON. That is right; whereas in California, in the sugar-beet countries up and down the irrigated valleys of the West, and the fruit and vegetable industries along the Atlantic coast, and along the Gulf of Mexico, the reverse is true, and that is largely carried on by the migratory labor. It is my personal opinion that the Extension Service should not be asked to take that very difficult load, and I think that is the general opinion of most of the State extension directors.

Mr. SNYDER. You do not think they would accept that responsibility?

Mr. WILSON. I think they would prefer not to take it.

Mr. SNYDER. I mean in States like Arizona or California?

Mr. WILSON. It is a very difficult operation for whoever has to do it. It is a long distance from our educational work and our service types of activities, and we deal largely with the small farmer and the home farmer that just has a hired man, or that kind of a thing, and not with the larger agricultural operations.

Mr. SNYDER. Would the Extension Service operate these camps?

Mr. WILSON. Personally I think it would be very unwise for them to do it. They have never done anything of that kind. Their personnel is not accustomed to handling that kind of business or the financial transactions involved, and they are very busy. The county extension workers are, I think, the busiest people in agriculture today.

Whenever a farmer is perplexed about any of the wartime problems the first place he goes is to the county agent's office. The demands on the county agent now are tremendous, and he does not have enough hours in the day as it is. The estimates provide that in the 2,200 counties we place emergency farm labor assistants, a

person who answers the telephone calls and talks to the farmers when they come in, and who knows if there is any hired man to be had, and so forth. That service can be rendered, but this other service, as far as the Extension Service is concerned, would have to be carried on by personnel added to it. The Extension Service is largely a decentralized affair. It is carried on cooperatively with the States. It is not entirely a Federal organization, and it is not directly responsible to the Secretary of Agriculture in the same sense that any of the straight departmental organizations are.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Mr. Johnson.

USE OF CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS CAMPS AND TOURIST CAMPS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I really wanted to ask the Secretary before he left about these migration camps, and if any thought had been given to using abandoned C. C. C. camps. There are several hundred of them throughout the country, and several of them are in the district I represent in Congress.

As I have said, they are really modern, up-to-date camps with gas and water, and they are not being utilized. I am just wondering why some of them could not be utilized for this purpose. Of course, a lot of them could not be moved because the first camps were not built in sections, but the Government has several million dollars invested in them, and the average is about $25,000 per camp. Some of them ought to utilized.

Mr. DARROW. My assistant, Mr. Morrell, who has been with the C. C. C. camp work, has mentioned this, and I know has under consideration the utilization of those camps, and also the use of some of these abandoned tourist camps. I believe Mr. Maycock could add to that.

Mr. MAYCOCK. Yes, Mr. Johnson. Unfortunately a number of these C. C. C. camps are located in forest areas and in other places where, because we are not able to move them, they could not be utilized, but in all cases where they are situated in labor-deficit areas and where they can be utilized for this purpose, we are figuring on trying to use them.

The tourist camp industry, especially, has been hard hit by these gasless and rubberless days, and we feel in many instances we can lease these tourist camps, which have sanitary facilities and water facilities and so forth already established, and we can merely expand them by adding some additional tents and tent sites to them.

So, in every way we are trying to develop this program in order to use existing materials and existing facilities in order that we might do the job more promptly, in order that we might do the job at less cost, and in order not to use any more critical materials that are needed in connection with the war than are absolutely necessary.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION FORMS 500 AND 502

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Now, Mr. Webster, considerable has been said here today about Forms FSA–500 and FSA–502, both of which bear the date of August 31, 1942. These are proposed contracts that the Department of Agriculture are requiring farmers who desire additional labor or help on their farms to sign. Will you state to the

committee whether or not you are insisting on these particular forms in all sections, or whether or not you are revising those contracts for certain sections, or whether you are discarding them altogether?

Mr. WEBSTER. I believe it was an oversight on the part of the Secretary that he did not make that point clear.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is what I thought.

Mr. WEBSTER. He has asked that these contracts be reviewed to see if they will be agreeable and workable for this season. Last week he sent two men to Arizona to meet with producers there to consider certain changes in the contract for the 1943 season in Arizona, and we are constantly reviewing these contracts for different areas.

PERSONAL HISTORY OF WAYNE H. DARROW

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will resume consideration of the estimate for the farm labor program. Mr. Taber has some questions.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions that I would like to ask Mr. Darrow.

Mr. Darrow, would you please give us your background a little bit more? You brought it down to a certain date. What have you done in the Department?

Mr. DARROW. In the Department first I was——

Mr. TABER. When?

Mr. DARROW. 1934, July 1. From then until May or June of 1937 I was regional contact representative in the Information Division, the representative for the Southwestern States, starting from about New Orleans and running to Salt Lake City. I changed later and I had Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, and Kansas.

I worked at that until I came in as head of the Regional Contact Section of the Division of Information in May, I believe, 1937.

Then in November 1938 I was made Director of the Division of Information of the triple A.

Mr. TABER. That is different than the set-up that gets out the yearbook and the farm bulletins, is it not?

Mr. DARROW. Yes. They come from the Office of Information.

At the beginning of the triple-A program the Division of Information was more distinct from the Office of Information——

Mr. TABER. Was it a publicity or propaganda proposition largely?

Mr. DARROW. No; it was and always has been an organization for releasing information to the public, reporting from time to time, from day to day, as a matter of fact, and for working with—and this is a task that I was particularly interested in—working with the elected farmer committeemen to get information to them to help them lead for themselves in administering their program.

Mr. TABER. How big a set-up did you have on that?

Mr. DARROW. The field force was about 5 to 10 people. I do not know whether you want to know about the secretaries and all that kind of thing. There were 5 top men for the 5 regions in the field.

Mr. TABER. And how much in the Department?

Mr. DARROW. In the Department the field force there was just a small force. About six or seven men. I am talking about the field side of it right now, not the whole Division of Information.

Mr. TABER. That is what you were charged with?

Mr. DARROW. When I first went to Washington.

Mr. TABER. What was there in the triple A set-up when you came to head that Information Division?

Mr. DARROW. When I came in there were close to 100 employees in the field and in Washington, and I reduced it as much as possible. I think I reduced it and kept it to about 80. That includes the secretaries and everybody else.

Mr. TABER. What did you have for 80 people to do on that job?

Mr. DARROW. What were we doing on that job?

Mr. TABER. To keep them busy.

Mr. DARROW. They were not only busy. They were usually snowed under, with the many demands for information about the program and the administration from all quarters, in Washington, from the correspondents and radio people, and many times from here on the hill. Our people had to get up the information that the administrative people needed, as well as information to get out there to help the farmers in carrying out the program.

Mr. TABER. You have been in that position how long? Three or four years?

Mr. DARROW. Yes. About 4 years.

AGRICULTURAL LABOR ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TABER. What do you propose to do in this set-up? I understand that you have part of it set up for the Extension Service. But let me have a picture of what you expect to do with the rest of it.

Mr. DARROW. First the Secretary on this move has put together the different parts of the labor program in the Department directly under him for the purpose of getting central formulation of policy and direction.

Mr. TABER. How much of a set-up is that?

Mr. DARROW. That is going to be as small a set-up as I can make it. I do not want to have a large set-up.

Mr. TABER. What do you mean by a small set-up? We are trying to get a picture of how big it is going to be.

Mr. DARROW. We have four of us right now, and we are borrowing help to do rush jobs so that we can get into action and get things done.

I will give you some examples.

I had to put a man, had to borrow him the other day, on clearing up a sugar-beet labor deal with the United States Employment Service, a rush thing. The growers were waiting. The industry was waiting. They wanted to move. We were not set up to proceed with it. So we asked the United States Employment Service to go ahead. The plans were already made to carry that part out and we asked the United States Employment Service to proceed at once subject to the provision that later on, as this whole labor program develops, Agriculture might want to take it over. There was a special job. I had to borrow a man for that.

I have got to get hold of somebody to pull the supply and demand figures on labor together. Those supply and demand figures are found partly in the B. A. E., partly in the F. S. A., and partly in the United States Employment Service. I do not want to have a section in there for statistics on supply and demand, but I must have some-

body who can get the figures for me so we can go over them with the Secretary and all of us use them to help get the labor where needed.

Mr. TABER. You have got a big bunch of these long-haired analysts, have you?

Mr. DARROW. No. We do not now have anybody. We are just borrowing help. It is going to be as small a staff as we can possibly get along with.

Mr. TABER. I am still trying to find out how many.

Mr. DARROW. I will have to give a rough guess on that. I should say 40 or 50 people would suffice.

Mr. TABER. What on earth would you do with 40 or 50 people there?

Mr. DARROW. Just such jobs as I have mentioned. There are many more of them. There are the wage stabilization boards. Something has to be done about them. Somebody has to dig into this subject to find out what can be done.

Mr. TABER. Why do you have to get into that?

Mr. DARROW. Someone has to do it.

Mr. TABER. These people out in these localities know what the wages are.

Mr. DARROW. I am told this by growers, for instance a man from California impressed me yesterday about it, I get the same thing from Florida, and it is said to be true more or less all over the country—that with the shortage of labor, growers get together and set some kind of a piece rate, and then the help is so short that one of the growers goes up in his price. That starts the rest of the growers going up, and we get a chaotic condition on wages in those localities.

I understand from the growers, from those that have reported to me, that the local boards expect to set their wages according to the varying rates——

Mr. TABER. How are you going to do that?

Mr. DARROW. By local initiative, local committees. We are not going to do that in my office; I can assure you that. That would be one of the things that would be worked out by these cooperating agencies.

Mr. TABER. This will relate to this imported labor?

Mr. DARROW. On the imported labor I believe that is all subject to whatever the international agreement is. This is on other labor.

Mr. TABER. You mean the labor that is recruited within the county?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. TABER. The ordinary labor that is working there on the farm, or just these groups that are to be hauled north and south?

Mr. DARROW. I think that it involves all of the seasonal labor. Perhaps year-round labor. Primarily migratory labor.

Mr. TABER. Has that presented any problem heretofore?

Mr. DARROW. Yes. I believe that has been a difficulty all the way through the labor shortage. I know it was discussed a lot last year, and I think that, Mr. Wilson, there are now some local farm wage stabilization boards. I do not know how many.

Mr. TABER. Under the War Labor Board?

Mr. DARROW. No.

Mr. TABER. Or someone else? Under you?

Mr. DARROW. No. It is under Agriculture.

Mr. WEBSTER. The boards are appointed by the Secretary and make determinations on prevailing wages.

Mr. TABER. You mean that people are taken in there and they are expected to receive the prevailing wage, which is fixed by these local boards?

Mr. WEBSTER. It is not exactly fixed, Mr. Taber. It is determined by what the going wage is.

The reason for that is this: You might have one man saying, "They are paying three dollars and a quarter a day," and another one saying, "They are paying three dollars and forty cents a day." We hold these hearings and get the consensus of what the going wage is, and then announce that; and that becomes the wage that is being paid these workers who are imported. It becomes more and less the official figure.

Mr. TABER. What else are you going to do with this set-up, Mr. Darrow?

Mr. DARROW. We have just one main object, and that is to do whatever is necessary to get other agencies to do whatever is necessary to get the labor that is needed to the farmers this year.

In carrying that out I want to hew right down to the line. I do not want to set up any duplicate organizations. I do not want to ride over any of them. I am not interested in any kind of social reform, let us say, or building up any organization or tearing down any organization. I want to hew right to the line and help these other organizations to get this job done and pull it all together for the Secretary to get central unification and coordination of it.

Already, as I have said, I have been thrown into it only this week. I have many hard jobs that are here right now—labor needed here, labor needed there. I am expected to get action.

So that is my concept, it is to——

INVENTORY OF LABOR NEEDS

Mr. TABER. Who has taken the inventory of what labor is needed?

Mr. DARROW. The farm plan work sheets that were used by the triple A committee men in making out the farm plans for production this year in the farm mobilization drive contain labor questions, and they are being summarized now. That is a part of it.

Mr. TABER. By whom?

Mr. DARROW. By the triple A committees in the counties and States.

There are other figures, however, on that. The U. S. Employment Service has figures on supply and demand. The F. S. A. has figures on supply and demand.

You see, these things are hard to get the exact truth about. Situations shift from time to time. What I want is a man who will get the information from each of those groups, put it together and get it into shape so that we can use it to determine policies and movements and actions.

Mr. TABER. How much of a job is that?

Mr. DARROW. It is quite a job. But I am not certain that one man can do it. I think it is probably too much for one man, but if one man ——

Mr. TABER. Are there not people in the field gathering this stuff up, county committee men probably working with the extension agents getting this stuff together like that?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Is not that the story?

Mr. DARROW. Yes. And when I say "one man" I mean just one man on my staff. Of course, to get all of this means many, many more people in this program.

Mr. TABER. We have got that picture.

Now, who goes into Mexico to recruit labor? Is it anybody from here who does the recruiting, or does Mexico do it or the Department do it?

Mr. DARROW. I am not sure about that. I have not had that job before. Do you know, Mr. Webster?

Mr. WEBSTER. It has been done jointly. We have had people in Mexico working with the Mexican officials.

Mr. TABER. Did I understand the Secretary this morning right? I understood him to say that representatives of the Employment Service had been down in there looking after the recruiting. Is that correct?

Mr. WEBSTER. That is correct. That was the procedure that was followed prior to the directive of January 23 from Mr. McNutt.

Mr. TABER. That ended that procedure?

Mr. WEBSTER. Under that directive the responsibility for recruiting farm labor was placed in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TABER. And the Employment Service has no duty to perform in connection with that any more?

Mr. DARROW. I would not believe they would.

Mr. TABER. Does that mean that you would have to send people down into Mexico and down into the States in the South that could spare labor, to do the recruiting?

Mr. DARROW. We figure on using existing agencies, like the F. S. A.

Mr. TABER. That is, the same gang would do it that made a mess of it last year?

Mr. DARROW. We have got to use the organization, I believe, that is set up to do the job. It is too late to set up another organization, as I understand it.

Mr. TABER. There are 2,200 counties, as I understand it, that are equipped with extension agents and able to operate. Does that mean that these extension agents do not know the localities where excess labor is available that can be used for these purposes?

Mr. DARROW. The extension agents are going to be very busy, and will need additional help to handle the problem given to them of local recruiting and placement.

Mr. TABER. The extension agents in my territory—and it is quite a farming territory—every one of them knows the communities where there is excess labor. They know the communities where there is a shortage of labor. I do not believe that there is one of them who does not have an intelligent picture all the way through the country.

Mr. DARROW. But when you take the migratory labor and you have to move them to other places you get a movement from a locality, a State, a county, or a part of a State, or more than a State, over State lines into other places——

Mr. TABER. Did you ever think about getting a railroad traffic man to handle that picture?

Mr. DARROW. That is something that was discussed this morning. Understand, I have not had this program. I am just getting into it. My idea is that you have got——

Mr. TABER. One railroad tariff man ought to handle that whole job. You would not need him for more than about 1 month, while you were getting the gang started; that is, if he were a good traffic man. I have seen them operate.

Mr. DARROW. Somebody has to operate it, somebody has to go on through and get the workers placed.

Mr. TABER. Do you know anything about these set-ups that you have in the localities?

Mr. DARROW. You mean the Extension set-up?

Mr. TABER. Who looks after these camps? Suppose there is a camp with 125 or 150 or perhaps 200 in a county. How much of a set-up do you have?

Mr. DARROW. I cannot answer. I have not been working in that field. Perhaps Mr. Wilson could tell you.

Mr. TABER. Does anybody know?

Mr. WEBSTER. I believe Mr. Maycock could tell you that.

FARM LABOR CAMP PERSONNEL

Mr. MAYCOCK. I can tell you approximately, Mr. Taber.

There would be a camp manager. He would have a clerk, or assistant, who would handle detailed matters, such as collections, for we are now charging a certain amount to the occupants of these housing units.

And there would be a woman, who would be a combination nurse, to look out for the health of the group, and caretaker of the children while the mothers—because most of them work—are away.

Mr. TABER. Then these groups that are handled this way, do they move their families along with them?

Mr. MAYCOCK. A number of them do.

Mr. TABER. And do you pay the fare for their families?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Yes, sir. When a family moves, the fare is paid for the children as well as the parents.

Mr. TABER. Whereabouts is this done?

Mr. MAYCOCK. I think that it is general on all of the moves that we have made of domestic workers from one area to another.

Mr. TABER. That is on the movement of workers, colored people from the South? Is there any movement en masse of any group except colored people from the South?

Mr. MAYCOCK. En masse, I do not recall any instances.

Mr. WEBSTER. I believe that the people that moved up into New York State were white people.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no.

Mr. WEBSTER. Some of them.

Mr. TABER. There are a few people coming from Kentucky and Tennessee.

Mr. WEBSTER. That is right.

Mr. TABER. As individuals, to go to work on dairy farms. They were white people. But the transient labor was all colored.

Mr. WEBSTER. I believe there were some people who were moved up there under this program from Kentucky who were white people, up near Rochester.

Mr. TABER. They may be. I do not know. I never heard about that. But the ones that I have seen were all colored.

How much money do you pay out to move a family like that?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Of course, it depends upon the distance and the number of people. We have estimated, as shown in the justifications before you, that the average per capita transportation cost for seasonal laborers will be $50.60. The average cost per family of year-round laborers is estimated at $80.

Mr. TABER. Do you have charge of that?

Mr. MAYCOCK. No; I do not, Mr. Taber.

Mr. TABER. Who could tell? Whom should I ask to find out who in the Farm Security racket sent out the telegram that I read here this morning?

Mr. MAYCOCK. We would have to go to Mr. Baldwin's administration in the Farm Security and find out from him who would have been likely to have made this reply. It was probably one of the regional Farm Security people.

It was stated as coming from Washington?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MAYCOCK. It was from Washington?

Mr. TABER. That was my understanding.

Mr. MAYCOCK. If it was from Washington, it would be easier to find out than if it were from the field. We can try to find out for you, Mr. Taber, if you would like; and we can let you know or insert it in the record—either one.

Mr. TABER. Do you mean that these people, when you take them out to the camps, do not know enough to take care of themselves and have to have a guardian to kind of look out for them?

Mr. MAYCOCK. I would not say that it is a guardian. It is someone to be responsible for the operation of the camp. I do know that we have to maintain order and fix responsibility in any type of organization. When the Army moves, when anyone moves a group of people, that is so. We feel that it is our responsibility to have someone there who is in charge, and to whom the farmers may come to get their labor. Someone has to be there to make those arrangements, to care for the Government property, to assign the workers to the various housing units, to collect fees from the occupants, and so forth.

Mr. TABER. You mean that the local Extension Service could not do that in just a few minutes if there is any trouble about making whatever arrangements that have to be made to handle that kind of situation?

Mr. MAYCOCK. I do not deny that the county extension agent could do the job. But if the camp were an active camp I would say that it would practically take his full time to do the job, and therefore he would not be able to do the other things which he has to do.

Mr. TABER. How many of these camps did you have last year?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Ninety-five.

Mr. TABER. Do you know anything about those, Mr. Darrow, at all?

Mr. DARROW. Just in a general way.

Mr. TABER. But you do not know anything about the character of them?

Mr. DARROW. No; I cannot say that I do.

Mr. TABER. Or the number that were transported, or anything of that kind?

Mr. DARROW. No; I do not know that.

Mr. TABER. So you are kind of taking this thing cold without having much idea of what it is all about?

Mr. DARROW. I know what it is about in general. I just started on Monday. I am having to dig into a lot of things very rapidly.

Mr. TABER. We have got to take one of these things here and give our answers the same day sometimes. So you are no worse off than we are on that. But in general at least I do try to get so I have a pretty good picture of what the thing is all about. That is what I have been trying to get here, and I have not had a picture that is satisfactory to an ordinary mortal so far. Maybe I am too thick, but I have not had it.

Mr. MAYCOCK. I would say, Mr. Taber, that we in the Department, a number of us, have had some of the same anxiety and feelings that you have just expressed. But unfortunately this program—or maybe fortunately, because it is a program caused by war—is something for which there is no pattern. We are having to make a lot of guesses and a lot of estimates. We are doing the best that we can. We are going to operate just as economically as we can. But we cannot give you in many instances specific information which we ourselves in the Department would have liked to have been able to have had to base our estimates on, because the specific information just does not exist.

Mr. TABER. But you operated this last year.

Mr. MAYCOCK. We operated it since the late summer or early fall of last year.

Mr. TABER. How much did you spend last year? How many people did you handle?

Mr. MAYCOCK. There is included in our justifications the number of people that we transported up to the date that we submitted the estimate. I think you will find it there under project No. 1.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Project No. 1 is transportation.

Mr. MAYCOCK. I understand that that is what we are talking about.

Mr. TABER. How many people did you handle?

Mr. WEBSTER. Around 10,000. I do not have the exact figure.

Mr. TABER. Around 10,000?

Mr. WEBSTER. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe I got that from the estimate here. I did not get the story of what happened last year.

Mr. MAYCOCK. It is under "What has been accomplished to date."

Mr. TABER. Under Project No. 1? Maybe there is something later there.

Mr. MAYCOCK. It is here [indicating].

Mr. TABER. 12,900.

Mr. MAYCOCK. Yes.

Mr. TABER. How many are you contemplating this year to get from outside the country, altogether?

Mr. MAYCOCK. We estimate approximately 50,000 from Mexico. But from what the Secretary said this morning, there are some difficulties down there. It might be that we will not be able to get that many from Mexico.

LABOR FROM BAHAMAS

Mr. TABER. How many do you think you will get from Bahama?

Mr. MAYCOCK. I do not believe that there has been any specific

estimate made. Mr. Darrow is sending a man down—he is leaving now—to make a survey down there and see what the possibilities are.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Taber, I understand that Mr. Hughes, the representative of the Bahama Government in these negotiations, said that he did not think they could supply more than about 3,000.

Mr. TABER. That would not be a very big item.

How about this group in Florida? How about the people down there who are available to work?

Mr. DARROW. The situation seems to be confused, as I get it; I mean, the reports that come from Florida. But there seems to be a good deal of demand down there for this work.

Mr. TABER. In ordinary seasons there is a great surplus of help down there?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. TABER. And has been for years. Maybe it is not there now.

Mr. DARROW. I think it is local, according to the vegetable crops.

Mr. TABER. If it is local, there ought to be part of it that could help out the rest of it.

Mr. DARROW. Those efforts have been made——

Mr. TABER. Who has made them?

Mr. DARROW. Through the United States Employment Service and the F. S. A. down there. And in spite of it all, people like Senator Pepper, for instance, who called me the other day from down there, said that there is such a need that even 3,000, if they could be gotten in, and judiciously placed, would help a great deal. Congressman Cannon called me yesterday about the same thing. He said that was his opinion.

Mr. TABER. You have half a dozen States that seem to be affected by it. There is a group going to New York and New Jersey, Connecticut, Washington, California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and then a small group to Florida. Last year a very small group comparatively went to Texas. It does not seem like you have covered so much territory that you needed a big administrative set-up on that.

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

Mr. DARROW. We do not plan a big administrative set-up at all for the labor administration, as I pointed out before, but rather, to use the agencies already set up and in the business.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The break-down shows 3,447 people that you had on it.

Mr. DARROW. But not in the labor administration.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In the project that we are talking about.

Mr. DARROW. But that involves the Extension Service, the F. S. A.—all of the Department agencies.

Mr. TABER. Where do you have a break-down in the justifications or in the hearings of this particular set-up?

The CHAIRMAN. There is a breakdown of this in the hearings, as I recall it.

Mr. TABER. It shows 1,018 in the field, with expenses of $1,400,000 out in the field. That is just for transportation. That is about six times what you need at least, and that is a very conservative picture.

You have the farm labor centers. You have quite a lot of people

above $3,000, and then you have 1,662 of those farm labor centers, with an $80,000 pay roll, and temporary employees, $124,000.

Then you have 300 camps. That means 5 to a camp besides your contemporary help. That seems way out of line according to your statement on these things.

Mr. MAYCOCK. Part of that project, Mr. Taber, calls for construction. When you deduct the estimated number of employees that will be working on construction, I think that you will find the average number, as I indicated before, would be approximately three to a camp.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Are all these engineers in there for construction?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Yes, sir. The engineers are for that purpose.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You have 12 associate engineers, 18 assistant engineers, and 10 sanitary engineers.

Mr. MAYCOCK. I think they would all be working in connection with construction of these camps.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Are they temporary or permanent?

Mr. MAYCOCK. They are full-time employees for the period of time necessary to construct the camps.

Mr. TABER. Then you have 17 in the Department and 24 in the field for the wage study. What on earth would you do with 17 people in the Department for that?

Mr. MAYCOCK. The 17 people in the Department for project 4, investigation of farm wage rates, would be to take the results of the information that is collected by the field groups and correlate it, analyze it——

Mr. TABER. You would not need more than two people to do that, would you?

Mr. MAYCOCK. The estimate of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics——

Mr. TABER. That, of course, would be way out of sight anyway. We have had experience with them. They come up here with high figures for getting simple things done. But if you had a good operator of one of these modern machines, and you had your staff in any shape at all, that does not take much help.

On your farm labor program, project 6, you have a great, big set-up there with an $8,500 item to start with, and 76 in the Department altogether, with an average pay roll of $2,700, and 565 in the field with an average pay roll, with these people working part of the time, a pay roll that must run at least $2,500. It looks to me as if the thing is just haywire, and that is all.

I would be glad to have an intelligent explanation of how you could spend all that money.

Mr. MAYCOCK. I can assure you that if it is not necessary to spend it——

Mr. TABER. Why do you make a set-up that looks that way?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Because it is our best estimate. Naturally, I realize that opinions differ.

Mr. TABER. It is ten or a dozen times as much as you had last year in many cases.

Mr. MAYCOCK. But we transported, you will notice in the statement, approximately 13,000 people.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MAYCOCK. And we are estimating that we may transport as many as 350,000 people. Now, we cannot transport 350,000 people with the same amount of money and supervision that we had last year to transport 13,000.

Mr. TABER. But you do not need so much additional help on top of it. A good traffic man could handle that transportation business quite easily.

UTILIZATION OF EXTENSION SERVICE

Now, Mr. Wilson, I want to ask you two or three things.

Could not your people take care of this situation out in the field after these people get there?

Mr. WILSON. I do not think they can operate the camps. Our plan has assumed that the county agent's office would be the center at which requests for labor would be filed.

But we have been discussing largely the migratory labor, which operates in connection with large-scale agriculture—the fruit industries on the Pacific coast, sugar beets in the irrigated valleys in the intermountain region, and the fruits and vegetables and canning industries along the Atlantic coast.

When the harvest seasons and when the peak seasons are on, there is a tremendous rush. Everything is tremendously speeded up. One county agent and a clerk, a home demonstration agent, and in some cases assistants to that county agent, are overworked people, rendering services that they render to the farmers at the present time.

Mr. TABER. All that needs is maybe a little extra clerical help.

Mr. WILSON. No.

Mr. TABER. That is all they need.

Mr. WILSON. No. The handling of this takes a great deal of field people on the job.

What the Employment Service did last year, I think, involved five or six hundred people. A farmer wants, let us say, 25 workers, or whatever it is—there is just an awful lot of service in connection with that kind of service. It is not just telephoning to some office and saying, "Here, I want 25 people," and 25 people mysteriously appear. It is not that.

In the general farming counties, where you are going to get all of the people in the towns and villages to volunteer to go out and work on the farms, and where you are going to get the youngsters from the high schools and maybe get some women—in those counties we do think that the county agent can handle this additional load without much assistance during this working season.

That is why in this budget there is a provision for assistants to be in the county agents' offices in 2,200 counties.

We assume that there are 2,200 counties of the 3,000 counties, or approximately 3,000 counties in the United States, in which this work that it is assigned to the Extension Service, would be of sufficient volume and sufficient character that the county agent would have to have a good deal of help.

Also I believe that there are 6,000 months of labor in the Extension budget which is to be used in the towns or villages or wherever it is needed during the rush season. There would have to be somebody at the local labor center to answer the telephone, to say to these

town men, "You volunteered to help. Here is this farmer out there that has got to have on next Wednesday and Thursday somebody to help him." There has to be, if those things are done, somebody on the job whose business it is to do it.

I do not think, Mr. Taber, that the Extension Service, with its educational background, that it is accustomed to do, and its big program of regular extension work that it is carrying on—I do not think it is wise myself for it to attempt to administer everything that has to do with the migratory labor, with the movement of that labor, with the transportation of it, with the settlement of wage disputes, and all of those complicated and difficult and ofttimes controversial things which enter into it.

Mr. TABER. I know the agricultural agents in my territory. I have not the slightest doubt but what they could do the job if they are are to be on top of it. They might have to have help of certain types, but they would not have to have the most expensive type of help.

Mr. WILSON. They have to have competent help.

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes. They have to have good clerical help, who can call people up.

In these counties the agents can do the job. They cannot answer the telephone when everybody calls up at once. Nor can they gather these data together as to the number that will be asked for. They cannot be expected to do that. But they can get clerical help without too much burden to do that.

Mr. WILSON. We in our Extension budget on that provided for that kind of service in 2,200 counties. The Extension directors with whom we have discussed it have felt that the item we have put in here is not sufficient to cover all that they will need. We cannot find out exactly what it will be. We are sure that this is our minimum need. And if we get into it, if we find that we have not estimated correctly, we hope that we could come back to the Budget and the Congress for more.

ADMINISTRATIVE COST IN TRANSPORTATION OF LABOR

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Let me ask you one question on that project No. 1. You have 10 field labor supervisors, 12 associate labor specialists, 18 assistant field labor supervisors, 12 regional farm labor supervisors, 24 assistant labor specialists, 251 assistant farm labor supervisors, which add up to something like 325. What are you going to do with all those labor supervisors?

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Maycock can tell you that.

Mr. MAYCOCK. Mr. Darrow will have nothing to do directly with those people. Everything in that group is for the Farm Security Administration.

In other words, those employees will work under the Farm Security Administration in carrying out this phase of the program, which the Secretary and Mr. Darrow intend to assign and delegate to the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. But what do you need so many of them for?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Our experience in the transportation program that we have had to date indicates that we cannot just wave a wand and have these people magically end up at the railroad station to be put on the train to be transported someplace. I explained in detail earlier

today why it will be necessary to have the employees to whom you refer.

It is apparent, of course, that you and Mr. Taber consider this estimate as high. I am aware of that. But our opinion is different. In the Department we consider that this is a reasonable estimate of the cost to do the job.

We realize that this is an expensive job. We do not consider this to be an inexpensive way of meeting the problem. We wish there was some less expensive way of meeting it.

This is an expensive type of program because it is being done under wartime conditions, with a labor scarcity. We do not ourselves wish to have to employ any more of this type of personnel than absolutely necessary because we are having difficulty even now in recruiting them. But if we are going to be able to recruit and place the laborers for which we feel there is going to be a need, in order that this Nation will have the food that it needs and for its allies, we consider this a reasonable and logical estimate of the amount of personnel and funds that we will have to have.

Mr. TABER. At the same time, it is a shot in the air without having much to base it on?

Mr. MAYCOCK. I agree with you, Mr. Taber, that we do not have any pattern, any precedent, to base it on.

Mr. TABER. You have 20 agencies loaning money in that department now. You could just cut out all of them but one, and put those folks to work at these other activities. If you came in here with that kind of program, you would have a chance to get considerable support. All these agencies loaning money are just disgusting.

Mr. LUDLOW. May I ask you a few questions? I suppose these should be directed to Mr. Darrow.

REQUIRED FARM LABOR SUPPLY

A large portion of this relates to migratory labor, as I understand, that you propose to bring in to operate these farms. The maximum of that would be about 350,000 people? Is that right?

Mr. DARROW. I believe that is right.

Mr. LUDLOW. That would be the very maximum.

Suppose you forgot all about the migratory labor in this program and should leave that to the laws of nature, as we have done before, and as an alternative or as an offset for this, give further consideration to releasing men from the Army. I cannot get out of my head but what there is provided there a source of farm labor that has been overlooked in this program.

I think Mr. Wickard testified this morning that that would bring just about the same number on to the farms that he anticipated from this migratory program, that is to say, 325,000 to 375,000 or something along in there.

One of those men in the Army, a farmer who has been inducted into the Army, is worth a dozen of these boys that you get from the city, clerks and soda fountain operators and men like that. What is your objection to making some approach to releasing those men so that they could go back where they really belong? Food is

just as important as gunpowder. If they could go back to the farm and do the work that they are best fitted to do, where they could perform most efficiently, why is not that a sensible thing to do?

Mr. DARROW. I have no objection to that, Mr. Ludlow, if it can be worked out without interfering with the military effort. We are talking with the Selective Service people along those lines.

I think that this whole farm labor shortage is a problem that has so many sides to it that you have to attack it on many fronts. To attack on just any one front will not do the job.

Mr. LUDLOW. There is not any one. But it looks as if you are neglecting that front of it altogether, as I understand it. I do not think that that should be done. I think that you ought to explore the possibilities of that further.

Mr. DARROW. Secretary Wickard pointed out that there are a number of things that have been done already and other things that are under discussion and consideration with the Selective Service people.

Mr. LUDLOW. How many do you think you need to bring your farm economy up to what it should be? How many workers are there that you do not now have?

Mr. DARROW. For seasonal help there should be three and a half million or more. I believe that that is normal.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is for part-time employment?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is for seasonal employment. How many for regular employment?

Mr. WEBSTER. There are a little less than eight and a half million workers on the farms now.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is, the labor supply is short three and a half million regular workers?

Mr. WEBSTER. That eight and a half million is the number of people working on farms.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is what are working on farms now?

Mr. WEBSTER. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. My question is directed to the shortage. How much of a shortage in seasonal labor and how much in year-round labor is there?

Mr. WEBSTER. As to the number of people working on farms the year round, I do not have the exact number. I would say about 200,000 under what it was a year ago. However, of the people working there were not nearly as many young fellows. There were more older people, youths and people who are not as efficient. So, while the number does not change too much——

Mr. LUDLOW. Could you give me a definite figure in response to my question as to what your estimated shortage in the seasonal and your estimated shortage in the year-round labor are?

Mr. WEBSTER. On February 1, 1943, there were 8,369,000 workers on farms. On February 1, 1942, the number was 8,540,000. These were mostly year-round workers. The shortage for the seasonal labor would be the figure that Mr. Darrow gave—three and a half million.

Mr. LUDLOW. How many do you estimate for the administration of this program? How many do you think you can recruit?

Mr. DARROW. Of the seasonal labor?

Mr. LUDLOW. Of both.

Mr. DARROW. I think we can get nearly, if not quite, all of the seasonal labor that is needed, these three and a half million or more. I think that will be much easier than to get experienced help. That problem is very, very tough. That is where some of these programs that have been discussed here come in, such as the F. S. A. program of recruiting workers from the less productive areas, people experienced some in farming already, and giving them training, as is being done, in cooperation with the Office of Education and the State colleges. You see, all of that adds up decidedly and gives relief.

On that program we estimate that perhaps 25,000 workers will be placed on farms, largely dairy farms, by July 1, and 50,000 by the end of the year. That is one of the biggest single things that will relieve the experienced labor shortage.

Mr. LUDLOW. Do you contemplate the replacement of farmers from the less productive farms to the more productive areas where they can do better work? That would have to be on a wholly voluntary basis, would it not?

Mr. DARROW. Oh, yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Would you not run up against the home sentiment?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. And the "no place like home" idea. I imagine you will find in a little rock pile down in the mountains of Kentucky that a man could not be induced voluntarily to leave that place. And that might be true in some other places.

Mr. DARROW. It is hard, I understand, to recruit some of those people. But it is entirely voluntary. Insofar as that can be done, it represents one of the greatest reliefs that we can bring to farmers who are in complex livestock, dairy, and poultry operations and need experienced help.

Mr. LUDLOW. Just one other question. How soon do you think that this program could be put into operation to relieve the farm situation for this year's crop?

Mr. DARROW. You are speaking of the experienced help now?

Mr. LUDLOW. I am speaking of this program. You have a program here for the recruiting of farm labor. How much of it under that program do you expect to recruit and how much it is going to relieve the situation that is now imminent for the production of this year's crops?

Mr. DARROW. We hope that we can relieve most of it as far as seasonal labor goes. And these programs are, many of them, already under way.

UTILIZATION OF EXTENSION SERVICE—EMPLOYMENT OF YOUTHS AND WOMEN

Now, the local recruitment programs that will be handled by the Extension Service are waiting. That is, I think the plans have been made and the time is very near when a campaign will have to be put on and we will have to get the volunteers——

Mr. LUDLOW. How soon can you start the machinery going to put this in motion?

Mr. DARROW. I believe you are ready to go right away, are you not, Mr. Wilson, as soon as the funds are available?

Mr. WILSON. That is right.

Mr. DARROW. Some of this work is already under way. The recruitment of high school youth through cooperative arrangements between the schools and the Extension Service is, I believe, under way this month. They are getting them recruited and will be training them through April and May for all-summer work.

Mr. TABER. Up in my territory I saw the superintendent of schools last week, Monday, and he said that all through my State the school superintendents had already taken an inventory in their schools of the boys and girls who are available for this thing. They have that all laid out. That part of it is all done. You do not need to have money in here to take care of that job.

Mr. WILSON. But that has not been done over most of the country.

Mr. TABER. It has not?

Mr. WILSON. It has not.

Mr. TABER. Do you mean that the pressure for that sort of thing is not as heavy in other places as it is in my territory, in New York?

Mr. WILSON. It has varied somewhat. But the recruiting of high school students to go out and work on farms, to go from cities and work on farms as a Nation-wide thing has not, I do not think, progressed that much. I think you are ahead of most of the country.

The best experience that we know of in that field was carried on in Vermont last year. Miss Dorothy Thompson had a great deal of interest in that movement. It was called the voluntary land corps.

There were about 600 boys and girls from New York who went up to Vermont farms. The boys and girls were rather carefully selected. I personally was somewhat skeptical about it. But I said to myself that the answer would be very simple in the fall. If the farmers in Vermont and New Hampshire who had had these New York boys wanted them back next year it was a success. About 80 percent, I believe, of the farmers who had had those city boys and girls wanted them back.

Mr. LUDLOW. What wages did they pay them?

Mr. WILSON. They were given a minimum wage last year which was the Army wage, $21 a month.

They said to these boys and girls, "Here is a chance to help your country. We need food. Here is a chance that you can do something for your country. If your family circumstances or your personal circumstances are such that during this vacation you have to make as much money as you can make, perhaps you had better go to a defense plant or something of that kind, because farmers cannot pay those kind of wages. But you will at least get $21 a month."

Then they said to the farmers, "Now, no one can tell how much good one of these city boys or girls will be. We are just going to try to put you on your honor. When you get through with them this fall and they go back, you pay them what you think they have produced for you."

The settlements varied, but in most cases I believe the farmer, when he was ready to have them go back, thought that they averaged out all the way from half to two-thirds of a hired man and in some cases, they said, just as much as a full hired man.

Now, on the basis of that experience we think we have learned a good deal. In working that out it is not only a problem of the city boy and girl, but it is also somewhat of a problem of the farm family.

There is a little problem there of getting the right boy, you see, connected with the right farm family. They found that there needed to be in the county agent's office a person who could look after about 100 of these youngsters, a person who had been a school teacher or a 4–H Club worker or somebody who understood youngsters and knew everybody in the community.

We do not have any way of estimating how many of those youngsters there will be from the city after they are selected that will want to go and work on farms this summer.

Mr. LUDLOW. How long were they working?

Mr. WILSON. From about the last of May or the first of June until about the 15th of September.

Mr. TABER. They stepped up the schools a little bit this year, did they not?

Mr. WILSON. I think they have. There were a surprising number of cases where a boy begged his folks back in New York to let him stay with this farm family and work for them.

Mr. LUDLOW. What percentage of them stuck it out?

Mr. WILSON. About two-thirds, as I recall. About 20 percent did not quite make it.

In that 20 percent of ecases part of the trouble was with the farmer and part with the youngster. But on the whole it worked out remarkably well.

We have estimated, in consultation with school people, that there can be mobilized 100,000 throughout the high schools of the country from the cities of, let us say, 25,000 and up—they are cities and not farm towns and villages—probably 100,000 high-school students from 16 on up—I think the average age of a high-school student is about 16. I think that would be the minimum—and the first 2 years of college.

Of course, you will not get boys over 18; but you will get girls that are over 18. And, by the way, it is surprising that the girls that went on those farms did pretty well.

These youngsters were carefully selected. You cannot take just every high-school youngster.

The thing was sort of put up to them this way, "We need food. Here is an opportunity to do something for your country."

And to the farmer and the farm family we would say something like this, "Of course, you are used to country boys. You have raised your own children, and so on. Here are youngsters that have come from New York. They are good youngsters. You just have to be a little tolerant with them and remember that they are from New York, and help them along for the first few weeks."

Where that was done, it worked out very well.

Miss Thompson tells a story of two girls who did farm work. They did everything. They worked for two neighboring Vermont farmers.

Those two girls when they would see each other this summer would say, "We don't know how we are getting along. We are working like sixty, but the farmers have never said much about it."

The day before they were to go home they heard some kind of fussing around. Pretty soon the neighbors started to come in. Twenty-five of the neighbors' families came in and they had a jolly time. They wanted these girls to promise that they would come back next summer.

There is, also, in this plan a permanent educational objective. This is a part of the idea that Miss Thompson has injected into this plan. There is a great life experience, an educational experience, a democratic experience, for a youngster from the city to go out and live and work with a farm family.

There are another 100,000 to 150,000 in the small towns, towns of over 5,000 to 10,000, that will go out to neighboring farms. That is much easier than taking them out from the city.

We have estimated that there are about 200,000 of these high-school students. Altogether we believe that there will be 650,000 boys and girls from high schools that will help on the farms this summer. The work will range all the way from picking potatoes to picking fruit, and all that kind of thing.

Then there is also a good deal of interest in women workers. How many women will go out and work on farms we do not know. But it is our judgment that the labor situation here this year is very much different than it has been heretofore, and that we will follow a good deal of the pattern that they followed in England, that is, that you have got to round up all the labor that there is in the towns and villages everywhere that you can get it and round up every hour of labor and get it to help.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. But you will still be short in spite of all that?

Mr. WILSON. I think you will, Mr. Johnson, particularly in these intensive farming places where canning crops and the like are produced.

DEFERMENT OF FARM LABOR

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Much has been said in this discussion about taking farmers out of the Army and returning them to farms. The fact is that if you got every farmer who is now in the armed forces of the United States back on the farms, you still would not be able to solve this situation, would you, if you got every one of them, and you know you are not going to do that, taking into consideration that the Navy is not giving up their men at all?

Mr. DARROW. I suppose that would be true.

Mr. LUDLOW. The estimate was 375,000. That is more than these migratory labor that they expect to get.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is the men in the armed forces.

Mr. LUDLOW. They thought they could get that many.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not think they said that.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is what the witness said.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. He said that a lot of these farm boys do not want to be furloughed. He further stated that some are getting better salaries in the Army than they could possibly get home on the farm. A lot of them like it better. A lot of them have desk jobs. You know, there are several men behind the front lines where there is one actually in combat. And some of them do not want to go back to the farms.

The Army does not like to release them unless they are past 38 years of age, and are essential to the farm industry, and that they are needed and needed badly on the farm.

Mr. O'NEAL. Can you imagine what it would be like in the Army to have every farmer boy sent back to the farm. He is one of the links

in the chain. They are all trained to do these things together. Just imagine what it would be like to train these boys and then take them away from the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is an absurdity to talk about taking every farm boy out of the armed forces. We are in a war. Some of these men have been in training for a year and a half. And it would take an act of Congress to do it, and I am not sure that Congress could do it.

The best that you can hope to do is to get those men who are willing furloughed back to the farms, those who are real farmers and who can convince their commanding officers that they are needed on the farm. That is what they will have to do.

Mr. DARROW. I think that is about as far as you can go, because I think you will have to have that, at least as it is now, on a voluntary basis. I cannot imagine that very many of those men in the Army are going to volunteer to go back on the farm.

Now, whether you can work out something whereby the Army would order certain men under certain circumstances to go back on furlough, I do not know. That matter has been discussed around quite a bit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say that I have a number of letters from men who were the only sons of farmers left on the farm, who have been drafted into the service. I have letters also from their fathers, mothers or their wives. They are trying to get them back to the farms.

I had a letter yesterday saying, "I have 220 acres of ground. My only son has been drafted into the service. That 220-acre farm will lie idle unless he is furloughed or released from the Army."

I have been trying desperately to get that one particular man, along with some others, furloughed. They do not want to be released. They would just like to be furloughed and go back and help plant the crops, and then get somebody to help to till and work the crops during harvest time.

I find that unless the commanding officer recommends that it be done, there is no way in the world to get it done. And a lot of the commanding officers do not look with any favor on doing it.

Mr. LUDLOW. Under military procedure, nobody is released from the Army unless he applies, himself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. LUDLOW. But in many instances where he applies, it does not mean he is going to be released. I would say not 1 out of 10 is being released. I might go further and say not 1 out of 100 is being released out of those who are filing applications to be released.

Mr. DARROW. Such moves are based on extreme hardship, is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Nearly always on extreme hardship. For instance, if a father has been taken ill and is unable to dress himself and do the chores, and this type of soldier is about the only one where you are getting anybody released.

One other question. As I understand your situation now, as you present it to the committee, the Extension Service is willing to take care of this situation as best it can within the States, but so far as out-of-State transient camps are concerned, you feel that that is an undertaking that could best be served by the Secretary through

whatever existing agencies he might designate? I will ask Mr. Willson that.

Mr. WILSON. Yes. By "out-of-State," I assume you mean the migratory laborer?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The migratory laborer; yes.

Mr. WILSON. And I would add a problem that we have not discussed, but it is the problem, of operating this farm labor problem in relation to the total manpower. As you know better than I, there is a manpower shortage not only in agriculture but all the way around. I assume that the Manpower Commission is trying to equalize this demand as well as it can.

There are places where there is surplus manpower on the farm. That means recruiting. Here we will say is a small hill farm. The productive capacity is not very great. It is home, sweet home, I know, but this is war, and if you can get that farmer to go some place where his labor will be far more productive, that would be a good thing.

I think it is too much to ask a county agent, who lives with and deals with the home folks, in that county, to try to recruit that farmer and get him to go some place else.

I received a telegram a day or so ago from an extension director, who was very vigorous in his statement that Farm Security was recruiting some farm labor from his State and sending that farm labor to Seattle, Wash. He said the States just north of him are yelling for labor. What was the sense of getting the labor and sending them to Seattle, Wash., when they were needed? It all sounded a little contradictory.

I called up Farm Security, and I got an explanation, and when I got it I could understand it. They said that Seattle was where the shipyards are. I assume that ships, in winning the war, are of tremendous importance; and, as far as our war program is concerned, labor for building ships is just as important as it can be. Yet the Seattle area is a dairy area, and it is one of the best areas of that type in the United States. It is full of milk cows.

Because of the shipyards being there, they pulled labor away from the dairy farms, so that the dairy farms were actually collapsing in many places. Not many dairy cows have gone to market, but the situation in Seattle with regard to it was collapsing.

Somebody—I presume in Farm Security—said that in order to keep these dairy farms, which are located in one of the most natural and one of the best dairy producing sections in the country, from collapsing, they just had to get labor to milk the cows and they had to get labor from somewhere and get labor there as quickly as they could.

These 25 families that went from this State to Seattle had been transported there by Farm Security. That was the reason why they had gone. It was a particularly distressing situation.

Mr. O'NEAL. I said before that I am a city man, and I do not know much about this problem, probably, but there is one thing about this program that I have not heard mentioned or touched, and it seemed to me it is a possibility.

For instance, if you are going to have a 10-percent shortage in the amount of beef to feed our people and for the other needs that we have, has your unit considered the possibility of increasing the

production of the farms where they do have some labor but are not working to their full capacity, maybe for lack of money?

I know that in my own home State the man next to me—I happen to have a farm—has 20 head of cattle. He won't take the chance of putting 50 head of cattle on his farm. He could double the amount of beef he could produce if somebody would help him to finance it. The same way with regard to the question of hogs.

Instead of trying to bring men on a farm to help out, have you given consideration to increasing the supply where there already is a supply of labor? Maybe there is an old man. Maybe he could take 50 head of cattle to water instead of 20. Just as a practical example, on this farm which I have, which has nobody on it, I have about 300 acres of pasturage. The man next door could use that farm. He could put 100 or 150 head on it, but he could not finance it. I see no provision for financing a thing of that sort here. You might get the people who already have a labor supply to use it to its maximum capacity.

The man next door to me wrote to me the other day and he said if he could get them, he would like to buy 6 cows, and if I would buy 6 cows he would milk all 12 of them.

You say that that you are figuring on a shortage of beef and pork. You say that a lot of these people are operating on less capacity than they are capable of. Might that not be taken care of if we would say, "The Government will help you produce more beef. We will put them out there and you take care of them"?

I do not know how expensive that would be, but certainly there would be a tremendous amount of meat. I do not know whether it would work on meats or not, but take eggs, butter, and chickens as an example. Maybe they do not have the money or do not want to take the chance involved in doing that.

There is a little financial involvement in putting 50 head of cattle on a farm. I know that I can go through my home State and see farmers running 20 head and I am perfectly sure they could run 50 head.

Has that been thought of? I do not see any money provided for getting the maximum production where you have the labor, instead of getting production where you do not have any.

Mr. DARROW. Yes. There are programs that help along that line. They can be called labor programs, too. We have been discussing here programs for taking the workers to the work. This program that you are pointing out is taking the work to the workers, and that is where the Department's program with F. S. A., and I think Extension has participated in that, too, has helped and is helping through extension of credit—

Mr. O'NEAL. But they do that on a loan basis. They make it possible for a man to buy it for himself. What I am talking about is this. If you want to increase the production of beef, do not leave it to the farmer to get himself involved in a loan involving a bigger chance than he should take.

In the interest of producing more meat or beef in this country, let us say, "We will help you and stand behind you on the addition of 20 head on this farm." I do not know what the possibilities are. As I say, I do not know a thing about it, being a city man, but it

looks to me, if you are going to run 10 percent short, that that might be given consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. You certainly have put your finger on a very important spot there. I have a letter from a woman whose son is in the Army. They have 3 cows to care for. They have pasture for 15 cows. There are several small children.

She said, "We have bought and paid for these cows within the last 3 years, but we do not have the money to buy the additional 12 cows."

They put it up to me. They said, "Can you not find some department or agency of the Government that will assist us in buying the additional 10 or 12 cows, so that we can actually make not only a living but make some money and buy the farm that we are living on?"

Mr. O'NEAL. They would not want to take the chance of buying 15 cows. They could not afford to do it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have referred them to the Farm Security Administration. I am inclined to think that they may get some relief there.

May I add here that there has been so much recrimination and discussion about the Farm Security Administration that one would think they are a bunch of criminals and crooks or incompetents.

I do not know what they have done in the city of New York or in Indiana or in Kentucky, but the Farm Security Administration in Oklahoma is run by practical, sane businessmen and farmers, and they have done an outstanding job—nothing that anybody will have to apologize for. I personally know the Ferm Security agents in a good many counties in Oklahoma, and they have certainly saved the day for the farmers who back in leaner days have not been able to help themselves. When you take into consideration that the loans they have made have been to farmers that could not get a dollar on the face of the earth from a bank or any other lending institution and that they have paid back more than 80 percent of those loans already. I think it fair to say they have done a remarkably good job since that agency is being tricked and cuffed around and I've joined in some criticism of it. I just want to say that for the record.

Mr. O'NEAL. Look at the job from the standpoint of producing what we need. Your question would not be a farm question of helping somebody else. This is a question of we are going to need so much beef; let us get it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. You are looking at the national need.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. DARROW. The Farm Security loans last year made substantial increases in production that did aid nationally.

Mr. O'NEAL. If you are going to leave the financial obligation up to these people, you are not going to get it. Instead of putting up $60,000,000 in chasing labor up here from the Bahamas or somewhere else, take the financial burden off the farmer. Increase what he can do and utilize all his labor 100 percent. It seems to me, on the question of national feeding, the Nation could do more with the facilities they have than they are now doing.

Mr. DARROW. The R. A. C. C. credit is designed to help on some of them. I am not sure about that.

Mr. O'NEAL. Frankly, I look on them as being employees of the Government, to take it out in profits, if you want to. These employ-

ees are not expected to carry the financial load. If a man has to obligate himself for 20 milk cows, it is more than any sensible businessman would do when he considers how much money he has in his corporation. In the interest of the national problem, I think it ought to be done by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further.

Thank you, gentlemen.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1943.

FARM LABOR CAMPS

STATEMENT OF HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

The CHAIRMAN. What item are you interested in, Mr. Stockman?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Farm labor camps.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very glad to have with us our colleague from Oregon, Mr. Lowell Stockman, and we should be very glad to have him make any statement he wishes to make at this time.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I have personal knowledge of the farm labor camp in Oregon, because that is very important to us. I am a wheat farmer by occupation, and I was actively engaged in it until I came here. On my own farm I have used the boys that have stayed at these migratory farm labor camps, and we regard them as extremely valuable out there. They are very important to us, but they are much more important to the men who raise both field peas and canning peas, inasmuch as the pea situation is one that has to be handled right now, or you just lose your peas. When peas are ripe and ready for canning they have to be canned and packed at that time. They are in the can within 4 hours after they have been in the fields. If they are left go for 24 hours it makes them too ripe to can. If they are left go some of those peas can be used for dried peas, but for canning peas it has to be done at an exact day and hour, and for that reason they have to have their labor available there when they need it. If you are engaged in the wheat, the cattle, or the sheep business, or anything like that, you can wait a day or two, but you cannot wait on these things, and that is why it is extremely important that they have their labor there at the particular time they need it.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are what are called flash crops, I believe; crops which need attention right at the time.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I presume that would be applicable, although I have never heard that expression before.

The CHAIRMAN. Their peak lasts a very short time, and it is very imperative to get the labor there at that particular time.

Mr. STOCKMAN. My particular county in Oregon raises 10 percent of the entire pea crop of the United States, that is, of the canned peas, so that you can see that it really is a major operation out there, and it is particularly necessary for the war effort, because the Army has frozen the pack of peas subject to their use, and I understand that they will use from one-third to one-half of the crop out there.

Mr. TABER. How do they handle the payment of this labor and the expenses of these camps?

Mr. STOCKMAN. They pay their labor every night, or every 24 hours.

Mr. TABER. That is, the farmer pays the labor?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes, the farmer pays them direct. Most of the big farmers, and there are several of them that have 4,000 to 6,000 acres in canning peas, have an office in the little town of Athena, which is a town of four or five hundred people, and they go in there each night and get a check for that day's pay, or they let it accumulate for a week. There are three of these farmers that operate their own canneries as well. It makes a tremendous investment for them, but that insures them of getting their peas canned.

The CHAIRMAN. They are processors as well as producers?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Stockman. You may extend your remarks when you get the transcript.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee.

FARM LABOR SUPPLY CENTERS STATE OF OREGON

The tabulation below shows the sites where farm labor supply centers in the State of Oregon operated during 1942.

Sites in Oregon operated in fiscal year 1942

Location	Number of workers	Period	Type of center	Crops
Nyssa	250	April to December	Standard	Beets, vegetables, potatoes.
Athena	300	June and July	Tent	Cannery peas.
West Stayton	300	July and August	do	Cannery beans.
Turner	200	do	do	Do.
Coburg	150	do	do	Cannery vegetables.
Merrill	250	September to November	do	Potatoes and beets.
Malin	200	do	Tent or other	Do.
Tulo Lake	200	do	do	Do.
Hood River	200	do	do	Fruit.
Medford	200	do	do	Do.
The Dalles	250	July to September	do	Do.
Yamhill	267	May to September	Standard	Do.

Crop Reporting Board, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1942—Oregon

Production	Rank in States, United States	Acreage	Percentage
Peas—for processing	Third	21,200	9.4 of all peas canned in United States, 1942.
Prunes, 76,300 tons	First		
Hops, 13,124,000 pounds	do	19,300	
Pears, 4,470,000 bushels	Third		
Dry field peas, 560,000 bags (100 pounds)	do	25,000	
Cherries, 21,100 tons	Fourth		
Strawberries, 1,075,000 crates	do	12,500	
Onions, 950,000 bags (100 pounds)	Eighth	3,8 0	
Lettuce, 194,000 crates	Ninth	1,700	
Apples, 2,660,000 bushels	Twelfth		
Snap beans, 42,000 bags (100 pounds)	Thirteenth	3,000	
Potatoes, 7,200,000 bushels	Seventeenth	36,000	
Peaches, 518,000 bushels	Ninteenth		
Tomatoes, 265,000 bushels	Twenty-fourth	1,000	

Crop Reporting Board, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1942—Oregon—Con.

County	Crop	Acreage
Malheur	Sugar beets	12,000
	Potatoes	3,800
	Onions	1,500
	Lettuce	600
Umatilla	Cannery peas	20,000
	Cherries	500
	Prunes	2,000
	Tomatoes	350
Klamath	Potatoes	12,000
Hood River	Apples	3,000
	Pears	4,000
Wasco	Cherries	3,000
	Apricots	600

Cases of peas:	
Alaska	131,842
Sweets	2,969,784
1942 actual cases	3,101,626

INDEX

LIST OF WITNESSES

INDEX

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 94

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 10, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for expenses necessary for the formulation, development, and execution, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and either independently or in cooperation with individuals or agencies, public or private, of a plan to assist in providing an adequate supply and distribution of labor, including sharecroppers and tenants (including aliens), for the production of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, including (1) recruiting, placement, and transportation of such labor within the conti-

1 nental United States and elsewhere, including transportation
2 of their families and household effects; (2) furnishing, by
3 loans, grants, or otherwise, of medical services, training, sub-
4 sistence, and shelter; (3) construction or lease and operation
5 of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and
6 services; (4) employment of persons (including aliens) and
7 organizations, by contract or otherwise, at the seat of gov-
8 ernment and elsewhere; (5) purchase, exchange, operation,
9 and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; (6) printing
10 and binding; (7) acceptance and utilization of voluntary and
11 uncompensated services; and (8) travel expenses of persons
12 employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating ca-
13 pacities from a foreign country to the United States and re-
14 turn, including such expenses to first-duty stations; there is
15 hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not
16 otherwise appropriated, the sum of $26,000,000, to remain
17 available until December 31, 1943: *Provided,* That expendi-
18 tures may be made hereunder without regard to section 3709,
19 Revised Statutes: *Provided further,* That whenever labor
20 shall be furnished hereunder to any other agency, public or
21 private, or individual, this appropriation shall be reimbursed
22 for expenditures on account of wages paid to such labor and
23 other expenditures in connection therewith to the extent
24 which the Secretary may determine to be practicable: *Pro-*
25 *vided further,* That effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding

1 section 3 of the Act of June 29, 1936 (40 U. S. C. 433), re-
2 ceipts derived for the account of the United States from the
3 use and occupancy of labor supply centers, including camps
4 and facilities heretofore used by or under the control of the
5 Farm Security Administration, shall be deposited in the
6 Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further,* That
7 not less than $6,000,000 of the appropriation herein shall
8 be allocated for use by or under the direction of the Exten-
9 sion Service and transfers may be made, with the approval
10 of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, from $20,000,-
11 000 of this appropriation to any bureau or office of the De-
12 partment of Agriculture, or to any other agency of the Gov-
13 ernment, which is assigned functions in connection herewith,
14 in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department
15 of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1943
16 and 1944: *Provided further,* That any payments made by
17 the United States or private employers to aliens under this
18 program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding
19 under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code: *Pro-*
20 *vided further,* That no part of the appropriation herein made
21 nor any of the funds heretofore appropriated or made avail-
22 able to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment,
23 transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used
24 directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum
25 wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or

1 to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or
2 union membership with respect to any agricultural labor ex-
3 empted under the provisions of sections 3 (f), 7 (c), and
4 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or
5 any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the
6 National Labor Relations Act.

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 94

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri

MARCH 10, 1943
Referred to the Committee on Appropriations

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2160. A bill to provide necessary funds through which to maintain adequate educational facilities in areas affected by the war effort, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 2161. A bill to provide for protection by war-damage insurance of leasehold interests in property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 2162. A bill amending the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to include illegitimate children as beneficiaries of automatic insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2163. A bill amending the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to permit designated beneficiaries to waive any benefits to which they are entitled in favor of a widow or child of the insured; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 2164. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1937, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 2165. A bill amending section 16 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit the removal of certain civil actions brought thereunder in any State court of competent jurisdiction to any court of the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2166. A bill to permit property of the Work Projects Administration to be continued to be used by State agencies for vocational training; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 2167. A bill relating to the exemption from the tax on transportation of property of amounts paid for such transportation by States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 2168. A bill to amend sections 6 and 11 of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," as amended, to provide for the grade of commodore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 2185. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2186. A bill for the protection of Indian tribal organizations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution authorizing the Food Administrator to prohibit shipments of lend-lease food supplies needed in America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution relating to emergency crop, seed, and feed loans, and to regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution providing for the permanent acquisition of the strategic islands from Bermuda to South America for air and naval bases as a reciprocal part of the lend-lease program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FAY:

H. Res. 162. Resolution creating a special committee to visit the various war fronts; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 163. Resolution authorizing expenses for the special committee provided for by House Resolution 162; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. Res. 164. Resolution providing additional compensation for assistant managers of telephone of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to construct a road to connect the present Seward-Hope Highway with Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation affecting the control of pollution from war industries in the Columbia River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GUYER:

H. R. 2169 (by request). A bill for the relief of H. B. Gilliam and C. E. Ellis, receivers of the Quantico Co., Inc., for balance of purchase price, rentals, and interest for lands occupied by the Marine Corps at Quantico, Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 2170. A bill for the relief of Jeannette C. Jones and minor children; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 2171. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Thomas P. Pendergrast; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 2172. A bill for the relief of Joseph Arreas (also known as Joseph Arraes); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 2173. A bill for the relief of Raymond James Perz; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2174. A bill for the relief of Ellen S. Huber; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2175. A bill for the relief of William F. Schmeltz; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2176. A bill for the relief of Howard B. Hill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2177. A bill for the relief of Earl J. Huber; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2178. A bill for the relief of the Service Fire Insurance Co. of New York; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2179. A bill for the relief of the leader of the Naval Academy Band; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2180. A bill for the relief of Kenton L. Mullenax; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2181. A bill for the relief of John G. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2182. A bill for the relief of John E. Haas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 2183. A bill for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2184. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set aside the trial-board conviction of Policeman William F. Fey and his resultant dismissal and to reinstate William F. Fey to his former position as a member of the Metropolitan Police Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

253. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition signed by Gladys H. Garrick and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 1111; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

254. By Mr. MUNDT: Petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing Congress concerning the condition of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

255. Also, petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing Congress to investigate the possibility of establishing a synthetic rubber plant at Yankton, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

256. By Mr. MOTT: House Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Forty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning the Congress of the United States to give unfavorable consideration to and to defeat the enactment of Senate bill 246 and House bills 1012 and 1115, each of which provides amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

257. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of the Toledo Branch, of which Mrs. J. Shuller is president and Mrs. Ben Latez is secretary, Pioneer Women's Organization, urging that action be taken for the relief of the persecuted Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

258. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, Local No. 148, San Francisco, Calif., relative to rationing program of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

259. Also, resolution of the Waiters' and Dairy Lunch Men's Union, Local 30, San Francisco, Calif., relative to the rationing program of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

260. Also, resolution of the Apartment and Hotel Employees' Union, Local No. 14, San Francisco, Calif., relative to rationing program of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

261. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, No. 1668, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to end the colonial system of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

262. Also, petition of the clerk of the house of representatives, Legislature of Oregon, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bills 1012 and 1115 and Senate bill 246; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

263. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution pledging the unqualified support of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island to the Governor in his efforts to make available to the United States Navy for a firing range, the Wickaboxet State Forest in lieu of 6,680 acres of taxable land in East Greenwich, West Greenwich, Exeter, and North Kingstown; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 96

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 11, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That for expenses necessary for the recruiting, training, and
4 placement of workers needed for the production and harvest-
5 ing of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution
6 of the war (including agricultural workers who are imported
7 into the United States from foreign countries and aliens in-
8 terned in the United States); to be expended under the
9 supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension
10 Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in
11 cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the

1 land-grant colleges in the respective States and in Puerto
2 Rico on the basis of existing cooperative agreements between
3 the Department and the land-grant colleges as to the con-
4 duct of extension work and apportioned to the States on
5 the basis of need for the purposes specified herein; for trans-
6 portation and subsistence of workers and expenditures for
7 construction, rental, or operation of temporary suitable
8 housing or shelter facilities for such workers where existing
9 housing facilities are not adequate (including for the pur-
10 poses specified herein, agricultural workers who are imported
11 into the United States from foreign countries and aliens
12 interned in the United States), to be expended under the
13 direction and supervision of the Agricultural Extension
14 Service in cooperation with the extension services of the
15 land-grant colleges in the respective States and Puerto Rico,
16 as hereinbefore specified, there is hereby appropriated, out
17 of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated,
18 the sum of $26,100,000, to remain available until December
19 31, 1943, of which not less than $100,000 shall be avail-
20 able for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of
21 Extension, and not less than $13,500,000 shall be appor-
22 tioned to the extension services in the States on the basis
23 of need to enable them to carry out their responsibilities
24 hereunder within the States, including the recruiting, train-
25 ing, and placement of farm labor, the provision, operation,

1 and supervision of temporary housing and shelter facilities
2 and the transportation, supervision, temporary subsistence,
3 and protection of workers within the States as herein pro-
4 vided; the remaining funds not to exceed $12,500,000 to
5 be available as provided herein to carry out cooperative
6 agreements with the United States Employment Service for
7 recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to
8 State, and imported workers, including the payment of nec-
9 essary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and
10 protection of such workers while en route, and including
11 also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned
12 temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm
13 Security Administration for the importation of workers from
14 Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the
15 existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and
16 of the United States with respect to the importation of
17 agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico
18 can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this Act,
19 but not to exceed a period of thirty days after the enact-
20 ment of this Act: *Provided,* That the Office of Extension
21 Service in the United States Department of Agriculture in
22 cooperation with the State extension services in the States
23 which are concerned in obtaining such labor are authorized
24 to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States
25 Employment Service to recruit and transport such domestic

1 and imported labor to and from the respective States and
2 the extension services in the States either individually or
3 collectively may enter into such agreements with the United
4 States Employment Service to recruit and transport such
5 labor, subject to general rules and regulations to be issued
6 by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the
7 United States Employment Services: *Provided further,*
8 That the extension services of the land-grant colleges shall
9 be responsible for the recruiting, training, transportation,
10 and placement of all such workers within their respective
11 States; and the Extension Service is authorized to accept
12 and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services and to
13 cooperate with any other public or private agency: *Pro-*
14 *vided further,* That existing farm labor camps and other
15 necessary housing or shelter facilities now owned or here-
16 after acquired by the United States Department of Agricul-
17 ture and former Civilian Conservation Corps camps where
18 suitably located shall be made available to such workers to the
19 extent they are required and shall be operated under the
20 supervision of the Extension Service as hereinbefore pro-
21 vided so long as such facilities are required for this purpose:
22 *Provided further,* That expenditures may be made here-
23 under without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes:
24 *Provided further,* That any payments made by the United
25 States or private employers to aliens brought in under this

1 program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding
2 under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code:
3 *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appro-
4 priated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made
5 available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment,
6 transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used
7 directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum
8 wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or
9 to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or
10 union membership with respect to any agricultural labor
11 exempted under the provisions of section 3 (f), 7 (c), and
12 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938,
13 or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of
14 the National Labor Relations Act.

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 96

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri

MARCH 11, 1943

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations

ward easier profit taking in this war until at least we have taken a forward step looking to the development of equal treatment in distributing the financial burdens of this war. Wage earners and farmers have their incomes limited by law, and I hope this body will develop a pattern of treatment which will include salary earners in a similar formula so that all America can go forward to victory bound by the same regulations and subject to the same restrictions in order that none may profit unfairly over the other in making the things it takes to win this war.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a very important event happened in my life, one that in certain respects made me feel chesty and in other respects made me feel good, yet it made me feel bad in a way. I make this statement to the House in order to explain my vote of a few minutes ago. That great day I speak of a few days ago happened when I filed my income-tax return. It made me feel chesty because it was the largest amount that I ever paid in my life in the way of an income tax. It made me feel somewhat little, because when I stopped to think, it was so insignificant and so small, what I was doing to carry on the great effort of our war. Then I thought about the many laws that this Congress had passed with reference to the war and I thought about the Selective Service Act whereby we required by law the youth of the land to register and to be taken into the service of our country. Those boys are now fighting the battles of decency and of democracy and, furthermore, they are fighting for my freedom and your freedom. Each and every one of us is more or less engaged in this war.

Last year two of my own nephews who were very dear to me lost their lives close to Bataan Peninsula and whatever remains of them now is in a watery grave. By action of Congress we took their all. I have another nephew, the last one old enough to go, who will be taken in a few days, 3 months before he would have obtained his degree from college. Yet he is going in the service. They are giving their all, and we have required it by law. What are we doing?

When we passed the price-control bill, this provision was inserted in it:

> The President may without regard to the limitation contained in clause 2, adjust wages and salaries to the extent that he finds necessary to correct gross inequities.

I have left out "in any case" which I do not think amounts to anything—

> And also aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

This to me gave the Commander in Chief authority to place ceilings upon all commodities, to stabilize wages where they are paid as wages, as well as to stabilize salaries. It was in effect giving him the authority which he exercised in placing a limit of $25,000, after all taxes were paid, upon salaries during the war.

When the vote came on this bill today I voted "No" and I take this time to tell you why I did so. I did it because I felt then and I feel now and I shall feel when I get up in the morning that if my Government can take from the youth of the land everything that is dear to them, even their lives, in order that we might be permitted to live in a free country and in order that civilization might prevail in the world, why should it not be equally as well for us to take from the man who is rich an amount in excess of $25,000, after all his taxes are paid of his annual salary to help in the war effort? I say this is a war, Mr. Speaker, wherein all of us should make our own sacrifices of whatever may be necessary to carry on our war program. I am happy for my vote today because I felt that they should pay and that every one of us should sacrifice, that money should come in and render its part. I think the man who is making over $25,000 a year and is not willing to contribute a part of it does not feel as I did the other day when I contributed that little insignificant amount, although it was the most I had ever contributed in my life to the running of this war.

I did not vote against raising the debt limit. I voted to draft money as well as the lives of the boys of our land in order that civilization might be maintained throughout the world.

(Mr. RUSSELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the current issue of the Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GIBSON (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Georgia), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. O'LEARY, for 1 week, on account of illness.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

> H. R. 1749. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits in certain World War No. 2 cases.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 15, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(Monday, March 15, 1943)

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings the resolution (H. J. Res. 92) to authorize the refund by the War Shipping Administrator of certain freights for transportation on frustrated voyages, on Monday, March 15, 1943, at 10 a. m. Further hearings on the bill will be announced later.

(Thursday, March 18, 1943)

The committee will also hald a public hearing on Thursday, March 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1361 (Mr. LANE) and H. R. 1409 (Mr. FOGARTY), conferring upon men in the merchant marine the same rights, privileges, and benefits accruing to those serving in the armed forces, and on H. R. 1858, to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war.

(Thursday, April 1, 1943)

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 1, 1943, at 10 a. m., on S. 163 (H. R. 498) to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship-construction reserve funds, and for other purposes.

Notice of postponement of hearing

(Thursday, April 15, 1943)

Congressman GEORGE J. BATES, of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on Thursday, April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee, duties of which will compel him to be absent from Washington on Thursday, April 8, 1943. Accordingly the hearing scheduled for that date has been changed to Thursday, April 15, 1943, at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Tuesday, March 16, 1943)

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 16, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 149.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(Tuesday, March 16, 1943)

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will meet at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, March 16, 1943, to consider House Joint Resolution 14, authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and

1936 with Panama, and other commitments.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(Wednesday, March 17, 1943)

There will be a hearing of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Wednesday, March 17, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 1607.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

243. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, Library of Congress, fiscal year 1944, involving an increase of $17,873, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 130); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

244. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

245. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust debts of individual Indians, associations of Indians, or Indian tribes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

246. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation, and for other purposes," approved February 11, 1936 (49 Stat. 1135); to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

247. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated June 30, 1942, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of, and review of reports on, Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.; Curtis Creek, Md.; and Cut-off Channel to inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 96. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2016. A bill for the relief of William H. Linhart; without amendment (Rept. No. 247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORT

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 150. Resolution requesting the President to furnish the House information as to the amount of petroleum products sent to Spain (Rept. No. 245). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2187. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 2188. A bill to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2192. A bill granting an increase in pension to Sophronia Bronson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 2193. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to certain veterans of the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution extending until April 30, 1943, the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), and for other purposes," so as to include certain employees of the District of Columbia government not entitled to its benefits; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to the war and post-war policies of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. Res. 165. Resolution requesting certain passport information from the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 1649; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 2189. A bill for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 2190. A bill for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2191. A bill for the relief of Arthur A. Guarino; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2194. A bill granting a pension to Evangeline R. Butler; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

264. By Mr. CASE: Petition of Rev. Adalbert Oesch, of Fairfax, S. Dak., urging that consideration be given to ministers in the low-salary group in regard to any proposed withholding tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

265. Also, memorial of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress to relieve all persons in the active military service of the United States from payment of income taxes or gross income taxes on their compensation received from the Government for such service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

266. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, pledging its support to the Governor of the State of Rhode Island in his efforts to induce the Navy to accept the Wickaboxet State Forest, for a firing range, in lieu of 6,680 acres of productive land the Navy proposes to condemn for this purpose; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

267. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Council of Administration, Department of Rhode Island, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, whole heartedly approving House bill 1604, a bill to authorize the erection of a United States veterans' hospital in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

268. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition signed by W. M. Coling and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 1111; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

269. By Mr. MUNDT: Petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the Townsend national recovery plan, known as House bill 1649; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

270. By Mr. SCOTT (by request): Petition of sundry residents of the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania in behalf of a bill to award a gold medal to Rev. Peter B. Duffee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Union Calendar No. 75

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 96

[Report No. 246]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 11, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations

MARCH 12, 1943

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for expenses necessary for the recruiting, training, and placement of workers needed for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war (including agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States); to be expended under the supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the

1 land-grant colleges in the respective States and in Puerto
2 Rico on the basis of existing cooperative agreements between
3 the Department and the land-grant colleges as to the con-
4 duct of extension work and apportioned to the States on
5 the basis of need for the purposes specified herein; for trans-
6 portation and subsistence of workers and expenditures for
7 construction, rental, or operation of temporary suitable
8 housing or shelter facilities for such workers where existing
9 housing facilities are not adequate (including for the pur-
10 poses specified herein, agricultural workers who are imported
11 into the United States from foreign countries and aliens
12 interned in the United States), to be expended under the
13 direction and supervision of the Agricultural Extension
14 Service in cooperation with the extension services of the
15 land-grant colleges in the respective States and Puerto Rico,
16 as hereinbefore specified, there is hereby appropriated, out
17 of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated,
18 the sum of $26,100,000, to remain available until December
19 31, 1943, of which not less than $100,000 shall be avail-
20 able for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of
21 Extension, and not less than $13,500,000 shall be appor-
22 tioned to the extension services in the States on the basis
23 of need to enable them to carry out their responsibilities
24 hereunder within the States, including the recruiting, train-
25 ing, and placement of farm labor, the provision, operation,

1 and supervision of temporary housing and shelter facilities
2 and the transportation, supervision, temporary subsistence,
3 and protection of workers within the States as herein pro-
4 vided; the remaining funds not to exceed $12,500,000 to
5 be available as provided herein to carry out cooperative
6 agreements with the United States Employment Service for
7 recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to
8 State, and imported workers, including the payment of nec-
9 essary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and
10 protection of such workers while en route, and including
11 also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned
12 temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm
13 Security Administration for the importation of workers from
14 Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the
15 existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and
16 of the United States with respect to the importation of
17 agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico
18 can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this Act,
19 but not to exceed a period of thirty days after the enact-
20 ment of this Act: *Provided*, That the Office of Extension
21 Service in the United States Department of Agriculture in
22 cooperation with the State extension services in the States
23 which are concerned in obtaining such labor are authorized
24 to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States
25 Employment Service to recruit and transport such domestic

1 and imported labor to and from the respective States and
2 the extension services in the States either individually or
3 collectively may enter into such agreements with the United
4 States Employment Service to recruit and transport such
5 labor, subject to general rules and regulations to be issued
6 by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the
7 United States Employment Services: *Provided further,*
8 That the extension services of the land-grant colleges shall
9 be responsible for the recruiting, training, transportation,
10 and placement of all such workers within their respective
11 States; and the Extension Service is authorized to accept
12 and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services and to
13 cooperate with any other public or private agency: *Pro-*
14 *vided further,* That existing farm labor camps and other
15 necessary housing or shelter facilities now owned or here-
16 after acquired by the United States Department of Agricul-
17 ture and former Civilian Conservation Corps camps where
18 suitably located shall be made available to such workers to the
19 extent they are required and shall be operated under the
20 supervision of the Extension Service as hereinbefore pro-
21 vided so long as such facilities are required for this purpose:
22 *Provided further,* That expenditures may be made here-
23 under without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes:
24 *Provided further,* That any payments made by the United
25 States or private employers to aliens brought in under this

1 program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding
2 under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code:
3 *Provided further,* That no part of the funds herein appro-
4 priated nor any of the funds hithereto appropriated or made
5 available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment,
6 transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used
7 directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum
8 wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or
9 to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or
10 union membership with respect to any agricultural labor
11 exempted under the provisions of section 3 (f), 7 (c), and
12 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938,
13 or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of
14 the National Labor Relations Act.

Union Calendar No. 75

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 96

[Report No. 246]

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri

MARCH 11, 1943

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations

MARCH 12, 1943

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

78TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 246

APPROPRIATION TO ASSIST IN PROVIDING A SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR, CALENDAR YEAR 1943

MARCH 12, 1943.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. J. Res. 96]

The Committee on Appropriations to which was referred House Joint Resolution 96, entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943" reports the measure without amendment and with a favorable recommendation for its early consideration and passage by the House.

Presentation of the accompanying joint resolution is in response to a Budget estimate of $65,075,000 submitted in House Document No. 106 of the present session to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate, develop, and execute, independently or in cooperation with individuals or public and private agencies, a plan to assist in providing an adequate supply and distribution of labor for the production of agricultural commodities essential for the prosecution of the war. The committee recommends the sum of $26,100,000, which is a reduction of $38,975,000 in the sum proposed for consideration. The appropriation is designed to assist in recruiting, transporting, and distributing such part of the requirements for farm labor for the crop year of 1943 as cannot be met through normal means or as will not result from other governmental action.

Union Calendar No. 75

It seems hardly necessary to stress the vital importance of an adequate food supply as a weapon of war for (1) our fighting front, (2) the United Nations fighting front, (3) our home front, and (4) the United Nations' home fronts. Our first obligation is to the fighting fronts both as to foods and munitions. Adequate food on the home fronts is necessary to maintain the economic structure of munitions production without which the fighting fronts cannot successfully function.

The production of agricultural commodities for the calendar year 1943 is to meet a need which exceeds that of the year 1942—the greatest production in our national history. The problem of that production is, however, beset with greater handicaps than confronted the previous year. These problems concern primarily manpower and equipment accompanied by the ever-present unpredictable but potent factor of weather conditions.

The responsibility of endeavoring to produce greater supplies of the agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war has been vested in the Secretary of Agriculture by the following steps:

1. Food production and processing by the Presidential food order of December 5, 1942.
2. Farm wage stabilization by the order of the Director of Economic Stabilization of November 30, 1942.
3. Farm labor supply by the directive of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission of January 23, 1943, subject to the continuing determination of the Commission as to policies and standards.

The anticipated shortage of farm labor is due to (1) inductions of men from the farms into the armed forces, (2) the migration of farm labor into the war industries, and (3) the immobility of much of the seasonal and other farm labor due to the restrictions on tires, gasoline, and other customary transportation facilities.

Agricultural employment normally is not a stable factor the year round. It fluctuates from the low level in the winter months to the high level in the fall months and is seasonal in various sections of the country dependent upon the character of the crops. In January of 1942, agricultural employment totaled approximately 8,250,000 while in October of the same year the peak reached was 11,750,000, a spread of 3,500,000 workers. The Department estimates that approximately three-fourths of the farm labor is family labor and one-fourth is hired labor.

Between the fall of 1941 and the fall of 1942 a total of 1,600,000 workers is estimated to have left agricultural pursuits. The Secretary of Agriculture advised the committee that 60 percent of the labor that has left the farms has gone into industry and 40 percent has entered the armed forces. He also stated that as of February 1 there were actually 200,000 less workers on the farms than there were on the same date a year ago. Some of these are being replaced but there are not enough replacements and they are not as efficient as the workers who left. Farmers face the problem of producing more with fewer and less efficiently trained workers.

The problem of replacing workers on the farms is not the simple one of finding a person who is willing to do farm work. Farming is a voca-

tion requiring long training and experience as well as judgment. The replacement of a person taken from this vocation by a person coming to it as an avocation means a less efficient performance of farm work. Some indoctrination and preliminary training for simple farm tasks may be helpful in utilizing persons unfamiliar with farm work. What is needed most is a cessation of the removal of the trained worker and the return of many who have left. Agriculture must have them to prevent a disruption of the production of the war weapon of food just as much as industry needs its highly trained and experienced mechanics to prevent a diminution in the output of war weapons of actual combat.

Farm labor supply has been under discussion for too long a time without adequate steps being taken to cope with it. The situation is critical and impending. Planting is already under way in some sections of the country, some crops are now being harvested, and the great bulk of the crops is soon to be planted. Unless agricultural producers can be assured of adequate help there is grave danger that our national food effort, crucial as it is, may suffer irreparable diminution with consequent disastrous effects upon our national economy and a lowering of the morale and effectiveness of the fighting fronts.

The ideas for replacements of the labor that has left the farms have been varied according to their sources. The principal suggestions comprise: (1) More specific instructions to local draft boards to secure deferment from military service of essential agricultural workers pursuant to the Tydings amendment; (2) release from the armed forces of trained agricultural workers previously inducted; (3) use of units of the armed forces under military command for emergency farm operations; (4) return from war industry to agriculture of those former agricultural workers enjoying military deferment as industrial workers; (5) lengthening of the industrial workweek to 54 hours for the purpose of creating a surplus of labor that would be available for farm work; and (6) a program for importation, recruitment, transportation, and training of farm labor to assist any other methods that may be adopted for relieving the shortage.

The problem presented to the committee in connection with this joint resolution concerns a determination of the funds needed in connection with the final category of suggestions. The program prepared by the Department has been explored in its various ramifications and opportunity has been presented to the various farm organizations to present their views as to the serious nature of the situation and their suggestions as to the methods of relieving it.

The plan presented by the Department estimates that 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 additional workers will be needed on the farms in the peak months as compared to the low level of the winter months. It is anticipated that about 90 percent of this labor will be recruited locally as heretofore. To supplement this local labor and to meet shortages that will occur in various sections from time to time due to the nature of the crops, the Department estimates that 350,000 seasonal workers will need to be recruited, transported, sheltered, and cared for, that 42,000 year-round laborers will need to be furnished, particularly for dairy and livestock farms, that 200,000 youths from cities and towns should be recruited, transported, trained, and placed on farms for varying periods, and that a project for recruiting and training women for farm work should be conducted to determine how successfully they

can be induced to enter and engage in farm work. The recruitment of seasonal workers contemplates the importation of approximately 50,000 Mexican laborers and inquiries are presently being made as to the possibility of securing labor from the Bahamas indicated at a maximum of around 3,000.

The program of the Department also contemplates the operation of farm labor camps of the Farm Security Administration (such camps now being operated to June 30 from current Farm Security Administration funds) and the construction and operation of 250 additional farm labor camps for the remainder of the calendar year. The total of 345 camps is estimated to have a capacity at one time of 122,500 persons comprising both workers and their families. These camps were planned for location throughout the United States at points where necessity for housing locally recruited labor, labor transported from State to State, or imported labor would be needed for farm work and where shelter for workers and their families could not otherwise suitably be met.

The principal component costs of the departmental program under the Budget estimate of $65,075,000 are set forth on pages 37 and 38 of the hearings. The six major items of cost are briefly summarized as follows:

1. Transportation, subsistence, medical care, etc., of 350,000 seasonal workers and movement of 42,000 year-round workers	$39, 920, 864
2. Construction of 250 new farm-labor camps and preparation of 300 sites and operation and maintenance of the 250 camps and 95 existing camps	17, 472, 072
3. Mobilization of local labor resources, including women for farm labor, and 200,000 nonfarm youth	6, 159, 305
4. Investigation of farm wages	96, 895
5. Studies to simplify agricultural operations for the purpose of reducing labor requirements	128, 434
6. Over-all administrative costs	1, 297, 430
Total	65, 075, 000

Many criticisms have come to the committee of the administration to date of the farm labor program by the department. These criticisms arise from national farm organizations and individuals who complain that the management has been too much under the domination of the Farm Security Administration with an attempt to bring about an ameliorization of social conditions along with the recruitment and supply operation which has caused friction, inefficiency, and undue delay in the prime and urgent objective of securing necessary workers.

There have been a number of changes in the Department both as to personnel and organization for administration of the program. Initially the responsibility for the task was assigned to the Food Production Administration in which there was established an Agricultural Labor Branch, the head of which was responsible to the Food Production Administration. As of March 1 the Agricultural Labor Branch was abolished and there was established an Agricultural Labor Administration, the head of which is to be the personal representative of the

Secretary of Agriculture and under the Secretary's general direction and supervision shall be—

> "responsible for the labor activities carried out by the Department, including the development, integration, and administration of programs for securing and effectively using agricultural manpower, programs for the operation of mobile and permanent labor centers, and such programs relating to farm wage rates and farm wage stabilization as may be necessary to carry out farm wage responsibilities of the Department; the investigation and presentation to appropriate Government agencies of the labor problems of the food processing and distributing industries; and the performance of all liaison with other Government agencies dealing with labor."

By this recent action there was sought a concentration of authority under the immediate supervision of the Secretary for the functioning of the program, subject, however, to the continuing control of the War Manpower Commission as to policies and standards.

The Budget estimate requested authority to enable the Secretary to allocate the appropriation, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to such bureaus and offices of the Department of Agriculture, or to any other agency of the Government, to which might be assigned functions in connection with the program. The committee has not approved this request.

In recommending the sum of $26,100,000 the committee has designated the agencies through which the Secretary is to function in carrying out the program and has allocated the funds accordingly.

The appropriation of $26,100,000 is segregated as follows:

1. To be apportioned to the State extension services for (*a*) recruitment, training, and placement of farm workers within the States; (*b*) intrastate transportation, supervision, temporary subsistence, and protection of workers; and (*c*) such temporary housing, including construction of additional facilities, rental, operation, and supervision of existing facilities as may be needed for any workers—total State funds	$13,500,000
2. Joint operation, Federal and State extension services and U. S. Employment Service, for recruitment, transportation, supervision, and protection of domestic workers transported from State to State and imported workers, to be handled through cooperative agreement	12,500,000
3. Administrative expenses, Federal Office of Extension Service	100,000
Total	26,100,000

The general program under the terms of the joint resolution provides for the expenditure of the funds under the supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States and in Puerto Rico

on the basis of existing cooperative agreements between the Department and the land-grant colleges as to the conduct of extension work.

The apportionment of $13,500,000 of the funds to the States is on the basis of their needs to carry out their responsibilities with respect to recruiting, transporting, etc., of intrastate labor and all temporary housing for labor—intrastate, interstate, and imported. The $12,500,000 is to be expended through the Federal Office of Extension Service and the State extension services, in cooperative agreement with the United States Employment Service, in the recruitment and transportation of domestic and imported labor to and from the respective States, and in so doing the extension services in the States, individually or collectively, are authorized to enter into agreements with the United States Employment Service, subject to general rules and regulations issued by the Federal Office of Extension Service and the United States Employment Service.

Provision is also made for the temporary allocation by the Federal Office of Extension Service of funds from the $12,500,000 to the Farm Security Administration for the importation of workers from Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and of the United States can be effected to conform to the provisions of the joint resolution, but this authority shall not be for more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the joint resolution.

Aside from the provision referred to in the preceding paragraph, no other allocation is made to the Farm Security Administration. The joint resolution provides that existing farm-labor camps and other necessary housing or shelter facilities now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States Department of Agriculture and former Civilian Conservation Corps camps, where suitably located, shall be made available to such agricultural workers and shall be operated under the supervision of the Extension Service so long as such facilities are required for the purposes of the farm-labor program.

The committee believes that the State extension services operating under the general plan set forth in the joint resolution and utilizing the United States Employment Service offices to the extent necessary will be able to handle the farm labor problem. A most difficult task is being imposed upon them but if Congress passes the joint resolution they will undertake it. This willingness is set forth in a memorandum of the action taken on March 5 and 6 last, by the executive committee of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities and printed on page 145 of the hearings.

The State extension services have a director in each State, county agents in each of some 3,000 counties, and the organization is familiar with local conditions and the needs of the farmers. The data furnished the committee indicate that more than 90 percent of the hired labor needed on the farms will be local labor and with the extension services now organized to handle this portion of the program the committee feels that the additional responsibilities given them under the joint resolution with respect to interstate and imported labor and housing can be met by augmentation of the present local personnel and the other expenses and facilities provided by the joint resolution.

The Department has received up to date for the farm labor program a total of $4,500,000 since July 1, all from the President's emergency

fund; $500,000 in July, $1,500,000 in October, and $3,000,000 in November. Of this sum there has been obligated to February 1 a total of $1,507,000, principally for transportation and subsistence of seasonal workers. The total number of persons transported to February 1 is 13,137, of whom 12,102 were workers, and included in the worker category were 5,314 laborers from the Republic of Mexico. The details of the transportation, cost, assignment, etc., of these workers will be found on page 20 of the hearings.

The committee in recommending the sum of $26,100,000 realizes that this is a program upon which there have been no prior procedures or experiences upon which to base the usually reliable estimates of cost or of numbers of workers. It is largely an exploratory plan that will have to feel and find its way as conditions develop and needs eventuate. The Budget estimate of $65,075,000 was arrived at after consideration of the part that each agency would be required to perform. The committee believes that many of the cost estimates are excessive. Administrative expenses appear to be predicated upon a more generous scale than should be necessary. Costs of construction and preparation of camps and the number of camps are on a high basis for temporary shelter. It seems to the committee that instead of providing so many new camps that there are in many of these communities unused tourists camps, Civilian Conservation Corps camps, and other buildings which could be temporarily and suitably fitted to serve the transient purpose at less expense. The committee seriously doubts that the estimates of numbers of persons to be transported and the distances calculated for their transportation can be realized. Experience thus far with the importation of workers from other countries does not indicate a realization of the estimates of such workers upon which the Budget estimate was predicated. The recent instructions from the War Manpower Commission to draft boards respecting the deferment of farm workers and the change in status of former farm workers in industry will result in the retention of many workers on the farms and bring about a decline in the rate of departure of such labor.

The committee has incorporated in the joint resolution a provision prohibiting this appropriation or any previous appropriation or allocation to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor from being used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. The committee regrets that inclusion of such a provision is necessary. Some of the practices at the inception of the program gave rise to the belief on the part of farmers and farm organizations that even though such and similar requirements might not have been an approved departmental policy, their purpose at least was so understood by many who had reason to believe that these practices were a part of the program and would result in the development of a critical situation between farm employers and farm labor which would not harmoniously promote the ends sought for food production. Departmental representatives have stated that

the purpose with respect to wages is to see that the prevailing rate in each community for particular crops is assured to workers who may be brought to that community. In connection with imported labor the agreement with Mexico (printed on p. 51 of the hearings) contains certain wage and other requirements. The committee feels that this provision will not have the effect of interfering with the Mexican-United States agreement or preventing the payment of the customary farm-labor rates in the various communities.

The committee also has denied funds for the investigations of farm wages and the studies to simplify agricultural operations. Prevailing farm wages in any county should be well known to the county agents of the Extension Service, to Agricultural Adjustment Administration committees, county war boards, and to other units either of the Department of Agriculture or other Federal agencies. The necessary data should be readily obtainable without further funds or much research. The amount for studies to simplify agricultural operations did not impress the committee as having any great substantial value as a Government project in the solution of the agricultural manpower problem. Some work of this nature has already been undertaken through the Extension Service in the land-grant colleges where it practically belongs. The use of $100,000 would probably initiate a project that would not be completed until after the war, if then, and at a time when ways and means are being sought to find work for people.

The committee's attention has been drawn to the fact that in some sections of the country complaint has arisen that labor needed in a particular area has not been available when required due to the movement of that labor into other areas by the Government. Most careful attention should be given both in the counties and in the States to see that any movement from either a county to a county or a State to another State does not result in an undersupply of farm labor in the community or State from which the labor is removed. Before any transportation out of a county or State is effected, clearance should be had with the appropriate county and State authorities so that local and State needs will not be jeopardized by an exodus which cannot be returned in time to meet the local or State crop requirements.

The committee is cognizant of the exigent importance of an adequate supply of farm labor at the right date and in the areas that will require it. Farm operations are largely governed by the laws of nature. There can be no evasions, court orders, stays, appeals, or postponements in the operation of these laws. They are immutable and inexorable. Farm labor either must be on hand when Nature decrees the time or it will not be needed at all and the national food supply will suffer. The committee feels that as the situation develops it will be found that the $26,100,000 provides a reasonable approximation of the cost of furnishing the essentials of the program if it is administered to the best advantage. The committee expects that these needs will be met as they arise and if cooperation in the execution of the program is lacking that it will be called to appropriate attention for remedial action. We are at war and frustrations, avoidable delays, and unnecessary requirements are inexcusable.

O

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, we do not present our supplications before Thee for our righteousness, but for Thy great mercies; turn us again and cause Thy face to shine and we shall be saved. Grant that those convulsed lands in the distress of gray and stormy skies may see the tokens of Thy will and Thy everliving and unchangeable nature.

Heavenly Father, we pray for wise understanding of that faith which values humanity and for spiritual devotion which endures. O keep us hopeful and courageous; no frown ever made a dark day radiant and no complaint ever made a heart happier nor the way smoother. We pray for strength to make us valiant when thoughts of regret linger and memory is threatened with bitterness. By inward sympathy unite our country in a common devotion and in a common work to set Thy people free. O forgive our own America for sharing in those sins unspoken and drooped down into the soul of a sorry, dejected world and in the light of a liberal, healing sun. Let every door which is barred by hate and revenge open to the living forms of cooperation and fellowship. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that we have a very full day today, and the Chair will only recognize Members to extend their remarks or to ask to speak at a later time, but not for 1 minute at this time.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have 15 minutes allotted to me today. I ask that that be canceled, and I ask unanimous consent that I may have 15 minutes to address the House on Friday of this week, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have here a press release from the Railroad Commission of the State of California, and I ask unanimous consent to have it placed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]?

There was no objection.

[The matter refer to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a report on the Ruml plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. PLUMLEY and Mr. HORAN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests, first, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a recent editorial commenting on the Canadian system of price control; and, second, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain letters and telegrams in reference to food production and distribution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost of printing the address of the Governor of Hawaii to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which was permitted to be included in the RECORD yesterday, involves an additional cost of $135. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table tomorrow and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two editorials from the Youngstown Vindicator of March 8 entitled "The New Draft Regulations" and "Dwarfs Cost of the Canal"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a brief editorial from the Evening Bulletin, Providence, R. I., of March 5, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

(Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter received from Mary H. Hartsock, legislative member of the East Wayne Advisory Council, Warren County, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and to include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. For the present the calling of bills on the Private Calendar will go over, as some Members in charge of those bills are not present.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 58, Rept. No. 251), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized, as a committee, by subcommittee, or otherwise, to continue during the present Congress the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 15, House Resolution 188, and House Resolution 383, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purposes such committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon such committee by House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress. Any unexpended balance of the appropriation authorized for the use of such committee under House Resolution 385 of the Seventy-seventh Congress is hereby continued for such purposes.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 170, Rept. No. 250), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1914) to amend the National Housing Act. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FARM LABOR PROGRAM, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943; and pending that motion, I should like to know if it would be agreeable to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to fix the time for general debate at 3 hours.

Mr. TABER. That is satisfactory to us.

Mr. O'NEAL. I trust sufficient time will be reserved so that those opposed to the bill will have an opportunity to express themselves.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Those opposed to the bill will have unlimited time.

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman will yield, I have had no knowledge that this bill was to be considered today. There is a great deal of opposition to the bill, I am informed, and a majority of the Members do not know about the bill.

Consequently, I feel sufficient time should be allowed so that there may be full discussion of the bill. Therefore, for the time being I object to fixing the time for general debate, because I believe many Members desire to be heard on the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I say that in the apportionment of the short time to which we necessarily will be limited on this bill, we shall appreciate it if Members who favor the bill will confine themselves to 5 minutes, if that is possible. It is our hope to give all those who oppose the bill all the time they require. I trust those who favor the bill will be agreeable to limiting their remarks to 5 minutes or waiting until the bill is read for amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. It seems to me the request of the chairman is very broad, but I believe many Members do not know anything about this joint resolution. It deals with the manpower problem and the expected food shortage in this country. It seems to me plenty of time for debate should be allowed so that the Members may be informed of just exactly what this resolution does.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the Members will stay on the floor, we expect every Member of this House to be fully advised as to every provision of the resolution before they are asked to vote on it.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

By unanimous consent, a call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 26]

Allen, Ill.	Cole, N. Y.	Gallagher
Baldwin, N. Y.	Colmer	Gibson
Buckley	Crawford	Goodwin
Burdick	Culkin	Guyer
Byrne	Dawson	Hagen
Camp	Dingell	Hale
Cannon, Fla.	Ditter	Harless, Ariz.
Clark	Domengeaux	Hart
Cochran	Fellows	Hébert
Hinshaw	Norton	Sumner, Ill.
Howell	O'Toole	Taylor
Jarman	Pfeifer	Thomas, N. J.
Kennedy	Philbin	Treadway
Lewis, Colo.	Reece, Tenn.	Walter
McGehee	Rogers, Calif.	West
McGregor	Satterfield	Whelchel, Ga.
Miller, Conn.	Scott	Winter
Morrison, La.	Shafer	Worley
Myers	Sheridan	
Newsome	Short	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

FARM LABOR PROGRAM, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 96, and pending that motion, may I ask the gentleman from New York if it is agreeable to him that we fix general debate at 3 hours.

Mr. TABER. I rather feel that in view of the interest there seems to be in the bill we had better make it 4 hours.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman divide the difference and say 3½ hours?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3½ hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 96, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I shall confine myself to 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the committee submits to the House a bill dealing with one of the most vital subjects before the Nation today. It is—in its prospective effect upon the war effort and in its importance as a factor in bringing the war to a victorious conclusion—one of the half dozen major bills of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

We are engaged in an all-out war. We face today the greatest crisis—the greatest peril that has confronted the Nation since Yorktown or Gettysburg. In this war there are two fronts—the battle front and the home front. And one is as important as the other. If we fail on the home front, our battle lines left without adequate support and supplies, are doomed.

Napoleon said, "An army traveled on its belly." And General Marshall—who with one modern equipped division of marines could drive the Grand Armée from Marengo to Austerlitz—told the

committee that food was as important as bullets as a munition of war. Military authorities are agreed that food will win the war and write the peace. And food is a product of the home front.

This bill is a bill to sustain the home front—to implement food production. The American farm must produce sufficient food to feed our civilian population, to feed our munition workers, to feed our armed forces, to provision lend-lease, and to sustain the armies of our allies. Otherwise there is no possible hope of victory. And after the war they must continue to supply sufficient food to sustain the famished nations of Europe until they can produce a crop of their own. There is no tenable alternative.

It is a prodigious order. And the appeal has gone out—over every radio, in every newspaper, and through every official channel—for increased production. The farmers are insistently urged to produce the greatest crop ever grown in America.

But as anxious as the farmers are to comply—and every farmer throughout the length and breadth of the land is working feverishly to turn out every pound of food he can grow—the farmer is facing a heavy handicap. Labor has been drained away from the farm by the draft and the war industries offering shorter hours, easier tasks, and vastly larger pay. Lack of machinery intensifies the labor shortage. And food cannot be produced without labor. While there is a greater demand for food than ever before, there is less labor—farm labor—to produce it than ever before. There is not a farm in the United States that is fully manned. And there is not a farm anywhere in the United States that is not threatened with further loss of manpower unless something can be done to halt the exodus and turn the tide back to the farm and back to larger production.

Of course, the first approach to the problem should have been through the exemption of keymen on essential farms from the draft. As time is limited permit me to revert to a statement which I made here on the floor when the subject was under discussion last year:

> The real solution of the problem of farm labor is not in bringing outside men to the farm, but in the retention on the farm of the experienced men already there. The man who comes in from the outside, from the city, even from other sections is not accustomed to standards of farm living; he is invariably inexperienced, unaccustomed, and uninformed, and unadaptable to farm operations, a profession which requires more careful training and education, in my opinion, than any other human avocation. You cannot train a farmer in 6 months, hardly in 6 years. You cannot bring in a man and make him an effective farm producer on short notice or through the agency of some employment agency.
>
> The solution of this problem is to keep on the farm the men already there, men who are thoroughly familiar with farm practices and acquainted with local conditions, men who have been farming from their youth up and who are experienced and proficient in producing food in greater quantity and at less expense than any other men you can bring in to supplant them.
>
> The plan of taking away from the farm and putting into the Army essential men on the farm and then trying to fill their places from the outside is utterly idiotic. It lacks every element of economy. The average man on the farm works a maximum of 96 hours a week. When you take him off the farm and put him in the factory he works a maximum of 45 hours a week. You are trading 96 hours' labor for 45 hours of labor and getting less in both volume and value of production. Clearly the way to conserve labor on the farm is to keep the labor you have there. Some provision should be made immediately for the exemption of essential men on the farm by requiring a certificate or clearance from their local board.

Deferment at that time would in itself have solved the problem although a far larger number have left the farm and are still leaving the farm, lured by higher wages, shorter days, and easier working conditions in the steam-heated and air-conditioned factories of the war industries.

But those are not factors which we can reach in legislation of this character. And so we approach the problem by the only avenue open to us. The measure submitted by the committee after long and arduous consideration provides funds to assist in recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing farm labor for the crop year of 1943. The bill has been reported and analyzed by the press and the printed report submitted with the bill explains it in detail. Suffice to say that in the considered judgment of the majority of a veteran committee of 43 experienced men it is the best solution available at this time.

But the bill is not a panacea. It is in our opinion the best approach that can be devised, but it will not solve the problem. No bill that could be passed by this House will solve the problem. Regardless of what we do or what can be done here today there will not be sufficient labor on the farms. Regardless of the legislation enacted or the amount provided to implement it there will not be enough food. But this is the best that can be done under the circumstances.

The amount recommended by the committee is $26,100,000. But the amount is in itself relatively unimportant. The mere appropriation of money will provide neither labor nor food. If it were that easy no sum would be too large.

It is the purpose for which the money is to be used and the method of its disposition that promises relief. Accordingly, the committee offers the method it considers most practicable and recommends a sum sufficient for its administration and no more.

There is some difference of opinion as to how much will be required. Some say it should be more and some think it should be less. Some want to increase it to $65,000,000 and some insist it should be reduced to $12,000,000. So it must be about right. Some consider the need for the bill imperative while others protest there is no need for such legislation of any character. Some object to the bill on the grounds that Republicans wrote it. Others are against it because it was formulated by a subcommittee with a majority of Democrats on the subcommittee and then reported out by a committee with a membership of 25 Democrats and only 18 Republicans. So it must be pretty much of a nonpartisan measure.

The important consideration is that there is desperate need of food and labor to produce food if we are to win the war. After exhaustive study this is the plan approved by a large majority of the committee. Time is short. Crops are already being planted. If farm labor is to be provided it must be provided soon. I trust the recommendation of the committee will be approved by the House and the bill started on its way while there is yet time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I stated, and I repeat, that I have been and I am now a friend of the farmer. For 36 years I have voted for nearly every bill that was admitted to be in the interest of the farmers of the country. I still feel that I can continue to aid the farmer and agriculture to the best of my ability. Yesterday we passed a bill authorizing the sale of 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, at a cost to the Government and the taxpayers of approximately between twenty-five and thirty million dollars, in the interest of the farmer. A few days ago we reported a rule on the Pace bill which is pending now. This morning we granted a rule on the Steagall bill to aid the farmer. We have also pending the Brown bill to aid the farmer, and we have several other bills pending to aid the farmer. Some of the bills I feel are unnecessary. This bill comes before the House with hardly any notice to the membership of the House. It is only by chance that I learned that it was to be called up by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is a very hard working, a very shrewd and clever gentleman, having at all times the interest of his and other farmers at heart, but who unfortunately sometimes goes far, far beyond the requests or even the desires of the farmers of the country. The gentleman from Missouri obtained unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with. Consequently I do not think that we have very many Members present who are familiar with the bill. I shall therefore take the privilege of reading a few extracts from the bill for your information. I read it hurriedly last night in the limited time I had, and gave it only a few minutes this morning, because I am kept so very, very busy granting rules for agricultural relief.

The bill provides, in part—

> That for expenses necessary for the recruiting, training, and placement of workers needed for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war (including agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States); to be expended under the supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States and in Puerto Rico on the basis of existing cooperative agreements between the Department and the land-grant

colleges as to the conduct of extension work and apportioned to the States on the basis of need for the purposes specified herein; for transportation and subsistence of workers and expenditures for construction, rental, or operation of temporary suitable housing or shelter facilities for such workers where existing housing facilities are not adequate (including for the purposes specified herein, agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States), to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Agricultural Extension Service in cooperation with the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States and Puerto Rico, as hereinbefore specified, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $26,100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943, of which not less than $100,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of Extension, and not less than $13,500,000 shall be apportioned to the extension services in the States on the basis of need to enable them to carry out their responsibilities hereunder within the States, including the recruiting, training, and placement of farm labor, the provision, operation, and supervision of temporary housing and shelter facilities and the transportation, supervision, temporary subsistence, and protection of workers within the States as herein provided; the remaining funds not to exceed $12,500,000 to be available as provided herein to carry out cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service for recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to State, and imported workers, including the payment of necessary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and protection of such workers while en route, and including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for the importation of workers from Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this act, but not to exceed a period of 30 days after the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That the Office of Extension Service in the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the State extension services in the States which are concerned in obtaining such labor are authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such domestic and imported labor to and from the respective States and the extension services in the States either individually or collectively may enter into such agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such labor, subject to general rules and regulations to be issued by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the United States Employment Services: *Provided further*, That the extension services of the land-grant colleges shall be responsible for the recruiting, training, transportation, and placement of all such workers within their respective States; and the Extension Service is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services and to cooperate with any other public or private agency: *Provided further*, That existing farm labor camps and other necessary housing or shelter facilities now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States Department of Agriculture and former Civilian Conservation Corps camps where suitably located shall be made available to such workers to the extent they are required and shall be operated under the supervision of the Extension Service as hereinbefore provided so long as such facilities are required for this purpose.

And so forth. The bill calls for an appropriation of $26,000,000. It authorizes the importation of farm labor, whether there is authority in our immigration laws for it or not. Under our immigration laws only a limited quota of people are permitted to enter the United States in any given time. Under this bill there is no provision to eliminate the restriction on the immigration, but I really would have no objection at this time to that provision permitting the importation of Mexican labor if such labor is needed. I know from past experience we have secured a great deal of farm labor from Mexico and a great deal of it is available today. I concede that we may have a shortage of farm labor. We also have a shortage of industrial and other labor. The shortage of farm labor was brought about because many of the boys have been drafted and are in the service. But there are many, many who have left the farms and who have accepted positions in industrial centers because they could earn more money there than they could on the farm.

In view of the situation that confronts our country, I think it is manifestly unfair that the farm boys, when we need the food that is produced on the farms, should have left the farms in such large numbers just because they can, for the time being, obtain a higher wage and can earn more money than they could on the farm.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I will in a moment. I sympathize with some of the farmers—not all of them—because I have maintained and I believe now that the vast majority of American farmers are better off today than ever before in the history of America. When gentlemen claim there will be a shortage of food because the farmers will not produce, because they are not receiving the compensation that is warranted because of the increase in wages they have to pay, I disagree with them. I believe the American farmer is certainly patriotic and will not go on strike and stop growing whatever crops he can, especially in view of the fact that we have eliminated nearly all restrictions as to the amount that a farmer can grow.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SABATH. I yield first to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I would just like to ask the gentleman if he does not feel that the Government is more responsible for draining those boys away from the farm, by putting on one side of the road a construction camp or some other kind of Government work, setting wages up to $8, $10, and $12 a day, and then expecting that boy to stay on the farm, when the farmer cannot get enough to even pay him $2.50 a day out of the product he produces?

Mr. SABATH. I think the War Department is responsible, because they have located many of the plants away out in the country where there was no labor available. I grant that some of the plants, such as powder plants, must be far removed from populated sections, but they have placed many of those big plants 30 or 40 miles away from thickly populated sections where they could have obtained sufficient labor. Consequently, some of the boys on the farms who have seen those plants grow up in their midst have left the farms thinking that they can obtain positions for the time being which will net them much greater incomes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I have enjoyed the gentleman's remarks thus far, but before he concludes, will the gentleman tell us whether he is for or against this bill?

Mr. SABATH. I am trying to explain why we should not vote for this bill. It is unnecessary at this time, notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is overanxious to serve the farmers, without giving proper consideration to the consumers of the Nation and to our Treasury.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with you. Will you yield to me?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Now, under this bill if it is passed, could we or could we not secure Mexican laborers for the purpose of doing the hand work in the sugar-beet fields, where we have to have them if we are going to harvest those sugar beets, because we do not have local help?

Mr. SABATH. For the information of the gentleman from Montana, that section of our country has always received Mexican labor whenever it was required.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But, as a rule, too late. That is what I am getting at.

Mr. SABATH. Because some of you people were too slow. The big growers always got the labor when they needed it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We lost crops because it was too late.

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Our boys have been taken into the Army and into the factories, and to replace these boys in their home communities while they are fighting, they are going to bring in these outsiders from Mexico and Puerto Rico?

Mr. SABATH. From Mexico.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Surely. Let our boys fight and die and let those fellows come and take their places at home.

Mr. SABATH. Now, before my time expires, this morning we granted a rule on the so-called Steagall bill. I wish you would hear what the proviso in that bill is. This brings up the point whether we are doing something for the farmers or not:

Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, rule, regulation, or order, no subsidy payment, parity payment, conservation payment, incentive payment, or payment in any other form or by any other term described, shall be deducted in establishing, maintaining, or adjusting maximum prices or in determining parity

or comparable prices for any agricultural commodity.

All these bills we have passed are in the interest of the farmers and I am for them, but I am against this bill because it is manifestly unfair in itself.

I feel that the people in their respective townships and the county and State authorities are able to handle the shortage of labor to better advantage than the Government agency. It is to be regretted that the people who are complaining and criticizing the so-called bureaucrats still try to give greater power to them when it suits their convenience or when they can be benefited. I feel the bill goes altogether too far, because if we go on record as favoring this bill, or if we pass it, to aid the farmers procure labor and import labor, what is there to prevent industries who also are short of labor asking for the same privilege? I am not in position to state whether this bill has been approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, a real friend of agriculture, but whether it has or not I feel we are entering on a dangerous policy.

As I stated before, some of the gentlemen will claim there is a shortage of food, notwithstanding that we had greater crops in 1942 than in 1941, and the estimates indicate that we will have still more abundant crops in 1943.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution is before the House as the result of a terrible situation that has afflicted the country as the result of the operations and figurings of the long-hairs in the Department of Agriculture and the O. P. A. There is no use of being mealy-mouthed about it; we might just as well acknowledge it. Without the slightest idea of what the agricultural situation is about they have gone ahead with their rationing and fixing of prices, not on the basis of what it would cost the farmer to get the stuff out, but on the basis of what would grind the farmer down. These incompetents, who frankly have more education than they have capacity to absorb, and that is a very charitable statement, have fixed the price of the farmer's product so low that he is unable to pay help in accordance with the competition he has to face. As a result we have an extreme shortage of farm labor. That situation has been getting worse and worse. It has been accentuated by the operations of the Labor Department, by the operations of the War Labor Board, where they have raised the wages without regard to the law, without regard to the going rate for a lot of the war program, way beyond what farmers could pay and so we are brought in here now facing that situation.

There are two possible remedies that really would help a lot. One would be for the O. P. A. to go through this whole situation and give the farmer a price for the things he has to raise that would let him pay wages in competition with those who are pulling help off the farm. That would draw a large amount of help back to the farm which has gone to the factory and which has gone into war operations.

Another thing would be for the Department of Agriculture to cease standing in the way of the farmer. At the present time they are trying, by means of subsidies which are highly inflationary and which cannot be controlled so they will do the job, to keep the prices down. As a result the farmer has become completely discouraged.

This bill has just been brought in here. Frankly I intend to support it. I do not like it; I will be perfectly frank with you. It is not as bad as the program that was brought to us from the Bureau of the Budget to permit the Farm Security Administration to continue to make a mess of the farm labor situation.

The Secretary of Agriculture and three different outfits were before us which he suggested the thing be turned over to. It was perfectly apparent that the whole outfit was incompetent to handle the situation; they showed it. There was not a man on the committee who heard the testimony who would get up and say that that outfit was competent to handle it.

At this time the bill provides $6,000,000 to be turned over to the extension service of the States so they may operate the labor service within the counties, and that covers 95 percent of whatever labor the Department proposed to attempt to produce for the farmer to start with.

There is also turned over to the Extension Service, under House Resolution 96, another $7,500,000, making a total of $13,500,000 for the purpose of handling outside labor and taking care of them within the counties where it is necessary perhaps to look after some housing.

Then there is $12,500,000 to be available to carry out cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service. This whole thing, however, would be under the direction of the extension agents in the local counties—and the State heads of this service, who are generally very competent people, people who have the confidence of the local communities.

It is a difficult situation. It has been made exceedingly difficult because the Secretary of Agriculture has failed to put someone in charge of the job and see that they were good enough and big enough to swing it. I do not have the slightest doubt but what the Extension agents in the country will do the job of getting labor together. Some labor is required in Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, that normally come across the border from Mexico. If they would allow the farmers to handle the situation themselves they could still do it in decent shape. But the administration has entered into an agreement with the Mexican administration and they would not allow that to happen any longer, but they allow the Mexican Government to go into the Mexican States to recruit labor. It is in a mess, but in view of the terrible situation which confronts the people in the border States, and in California, I do not want to stand in the way of what Mexican labor could be brought in that way. We have, however, tried to provide for it in a way that would be intelligent.

I do not believe they can get 50,000. I was satisfied that Secretary Wickard felt they could not get 50,000. I think they can get 10,000 or 15,000, and that would be about the limit.

Then there is a proposal to take colored labor from the South and bring it North as the crop matures. That has been very useful in the vegetables and the fruit crops.

Then there is a small item here for going into the mountains of Tennessee and Kentucky and taking dairymen who are brought into the dairy States to help on the farm. From that money some good things have come.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, on the other hand, the way the Farm Security Administration has operated it has been terrible. I was home the other day and there arrived in my home town, sent there by the Farm Security Administration, a man from the Kentucky mountains with a wife and six children for whom the Farm Security Administration had provided no job and no place to live. The first place he landed was the local relief office. That is the way they have been operating. I am just telling you one instance; I could go along a good ways.

The Farm Security Administration down to the time they came to us had spent $189,000 and obligated a million and a half. The President allocated four and one-half millions to them. It is perfectly apparent they have gotten nowhere, and they are going to get nowhere. The only way we can get anything in the way of farm labor is to do what we have set up here. The Executive Committee of the Extension Service here in Washington voted to assume this burden; we gave it to them after that. I hope the House will permit this to be tried out because it is the only way I see that the Federal Government can do anything to help the farm labor situation and counteract that terrible situation that these incompetents in the Department of Agriculture and the O. P. A. have created. It is a terrible situation, but we have got to do the best we can to work out of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to this bill. I regret that I shall hardly have time to analyze it as I should like to analyze it for the House, but I state to you that in the several years I have been here this is the most amazing performance I have witnessed.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the Dirksen bill, sponsored by a very highly regarded member of the minority party. This bill overrules the Secretary of Agriculture and in effect it denounces and condemns the Department of Agriculture as incompetent and unable to do this job. In effect, it also denounces the Secretary of Agriculture as incompetent and incapable of doing this job. Further, in its amazing provisions, brought out by

the gentleman from Illinois, it requires that this Government change the contract that has been made through long negotiation with Mexico and let the Extension Service and the Employment Service write a new agreement. It almost in that way advocates breaking a treaty. Further, it has the effrontery to say to the Secretary of Agriculture: "We will give you 30 days to get out of this business and no longer." That, Mr. Chairman, is what this bill does. I have the highest respect and regard for the gentleman from Illinois; he is persuasive; he is always intelligent, and he is doing a good job which he thinks is proper. I am one of his greatest admirers in this House; but, Mr. Chairman, this bill is written in my opinion with hatred for the agricultural administration, and with disrespect for its leadership. If such were not the case I do not believe that the Dirksen bill and plan would have been offered.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. After I explain the bill a little further I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

In addition to that, this bill does something which I believe should not be done at this time. I do not think you could do any job by dividing authority, by saying to 48 States that they do this job, instead of placing the responsibility definitely in the hands of some one particular authority, a matter so important as the production of food for the needs of this country, our allies, and their soldiers.

The Commander in Chief of the American Army, the President of the United States, recognizing manpower as a war problem, named the War Manpower Commission as the one agency to handle the over-all manpower problem. The War Manpower Commission, as a part of the war program, named the Secretary of Agriculture and the agricultural administration on January 23 as the agency to handle the farm-labor problem; so there is a direct succession as a matter of conducting the war effort, putting into the hands of the Secretary the job of handling this thing, of making a greater supply of labor available in order to produce more food. Everyone can make mistakes; probably everyone may fall down on the job to a certain extent, but the Commander in Chief put this job in the hands of the War Manpower Commission, and in this bill introduced and passed out by the gentleman from Illinois we take that authority away from the war agency and adopt a different plan. I should now like, as briefly as I can, to make this bill a little bit clearer to the membership if possible.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I understand that the Department of Agriculture is against this proposal?

Mr. O'NEAL. The Department of Agriculture would naturally be because it has been kicked out of the picture.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Do I understand further that the farm organizations—for instance, the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation—are likewise against the bill?

Mr. O'NEAL. I am coming to that. That is a part of what I want to say. May I say at this time that no two people of all the experts, Congressmen, farm organizations, or anyone else, agreed on any program. There was tremendous confusion, even among our colleagues who came before us. None of them saw it the same way. The same thing is true of the four farm bureau organizations that came before us. They did not agree in any important particulars, and, as to the Dirksen bill, there were some objections which they voiced. There was objection to the very thing I am discussing.

They doubted the wisdom of taking it away from the Department of Agriculture. My point is not that this is brought in here by a Member of the minority. I confess they do many good things on the minority side, and I would support the bill readily even though the sponsorship came from that side of the aisle if it were the practical, sound thing to do. My opposition is based on the fact that it is not logical, it is not well thought out, and it is not practical. We are trifling and fiddling with a problem of tremendous importance, and the only way I know to do it is through your constituted authorities who are charged by the Manpower Commission with doing it.

The Secretary sent his recommendation and came before the committee and asked for $65,000,000. In that amount was $6,000,000 which is no longer in dispute from anybody's standpoint, which was to be used through the Secretary of Agriculture and the State extension bureaus to recruit intrastate labor. The farm bureaus backed that up and everyone seemed to be in favor of it, and it is in the Secretary's bill and the Dirksen bill. The intrastate labor which is being considered is 90 percent of all the labor that is to be recruited. So there was complete agreement by all in the Secretary's recommendation that he was willing to turn $6,000,000 over to the extension services for intrastate labor. There is no quarrel about that and it is 90 percent of the job as far as numbers are concerned.

The Secretary also recommended the construction of 250 camps for migratory labor, and there are now in operation 95 camps. He asked for $17,000,000 plus for that operation and then asked for $39,000,000 for the transportation of seasonal workers. The amount of workers they hoped to get was 350,000 seasonal workers and about 42,000 all-year-round workers to be taken from one State to another or from Mexico to this country or from the Bahamas to the Florida coast. That is all the Secretary's bill recommended.

Then they called in the various farm organizations for their advice. These farm organizations did not discuss specifically at the first meeting, and it is all in the hearings, the question of whether this amount of money was right or how the program should proceed, but did discuss the broad problem of greater production of food on the farms and their recommendations, or at least a part of them, were to the effect we should lenghten the week to 54 hours, with no extra overtime, and that we should exempt the boys from service in the Army and general things of that character.

The committee asked them to come back with more specific recommendations. They came back and tried to be more specific as to the type of bill that should be written.

As a result of that the committee brought out House Joint Resolution 94, which is available here. What we have under discussion is House Joint Resolution 96. In House Joint Resolution 94 the Secretary, the committee and the subcommittee recommended practically what the Secretary asked for except that it cut down the amount of money to $26,000,000. In the report of the committee on House Joint Resolution 94 there is made this Statement which is very interesting in the light of the change now in adopting the Dirksen bill. Apparently the committee changed its point of view very materially.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield for a question at this point?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman tell us just why the committee did not follow the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture when he recommended the $65,000,000 or thereabouts and distribution, as the gentleman already told us?

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman will have to draw his own deductions. I am giving the whole picture. The gentleman can draw his own deductions from that.

In reporting House Joint Resolution 94, the committee said this:

> The committee is glad to note that by this action there has been a concentration of responsibility under the immediate supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture for the functioning of the program and that the policies and procedures for its operation will emanate directly from his immediate control and not be dispersed among the agencies to be utilized in giving effect to the various phases. The committee has left the selection of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture to implement the program to the designation of the Secretary. It does so in view of the issuance of this order of March 1.

That is where there was created a War Labor Board. So they felt the Farm Security Administration, which seems to be particularly under a cloud, was taken out of the picture by the issuance of this order. That was the action of the committee in reporting House Joint Resolution 94.

Then the various farm organizations came in with more specific recommendations, and finally the bill came out known as the Dirksen bill. That bill, Mr. Chairman, kicking the Secretary of Agriculture out and kicking the Agriculture Department out, does not conform completely to the recommendations of these farm organizations. Possibly one did. The others did not. Furthermore, all of them recommended, as far as I recall, not $26,000,000, but $37,000,000.

So we have before us today a bill brought out by the minority reducing the amount without reasonable cause. No-

body recommended that amount. The committee brought out the same amount but not upon the recommendation of one so-called expert.

Further, the bill was brought out discharging the Secretary of Agriculture, telling him to get out of this international situation, change the contract which was made, and do it within 30 days. That was not recommended by the farm organizations. I could read to you expressions by them in which most of them recommended keeping it with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this whole bill is an unscientific way to approach the problem. Perhaps no one can solve this problem. The War Manpower Commission has given that responsibility to the Secretary of Agriculture. If you do not like it, if you do not like his organization, then, as Old Bill, in Bairnsfeather's cartoon, said, "If you know a better 'ole, go to it."

You cannot solve the job of transporting labor across State lines and bringing the workers in from foreign countries by turning it over to the State extension services and the United States Employment Office, and ordering them to negotiate a new contract, and certainly not within a short time, and time is all important.

I say that the Secretary of Agriculture, although you may not like him, has not had a fair chance to demonstrate what he could do on this job. He was not charged with the prime responsibility of doing this job until January 23 of this year. He was given $4,500,000 out of the President's fund in September. The job began after the summer season was over. At that, he recruited 13,000 men and brought over 5,000 Mexicans into this country to help with the job. The only hope of getting this job done with any amount of intelligence is to do it as a war measure through the agency, the only agency, that is competent to do it.

The truth of the matter is that there is involved some sort of hatred, some sort of suspicion; somebody does not like somebody else. They are always bringing up this question, "Let us get it away from the Department of Agriculture because they are interested in social objectives," or "There is too much concentration of power in Washington."

Here is this apparently small amount, $26,000,000, to change the nature of our country and to bring more concentration to Washington. Yet, without criticism, I have seen colleagues on both sides of the aisle come here since 1936 and get $6,000,000,000 of Federal money for the farmer, and all of it out-of-pocket expense. The control of that vast sum in Washington was under that same Department of Agriculture, which you are not now willing to trust with a little $26,000,000. The Government granted as much as one billion for 1 year. The farm representatives then came here and asked the Federal Government to do a little something along social objective lines. Our farm bureaus, with all due credit to them, were here advocating it and asking the Federal Government to put out this $6,000,000,000 to help the farmer. Were they afraid then of too much control in Washington? Yet now there is all this hate for the Department of Agriculture because $26,000,000 is to be expended by it.

At the proper time I intend to offer as a substitute for this bill House Joint Resolution 94, which was brought out first by the committee, which also provides $26,000,000, $6,000,000 of which will handle 90 percent of the labor problem through the Extension Service, the balance to be used as the Secretary in his judgment feels is necessary to promote more farm labor, the only distinction being that we place the responsibility where it should be placed, with the Secretary of Agriculture, and do not divide the responsibility among 48 different States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. It seems to me that all of us, due to the fact that we are at war, seem to be a little overnervous and critical. We expect everybody to do a big job. We try to tell this fellow that he made a mistake, and we overemphasize it. I believe the war effort would go much better if we would criticize where vital things were concerned and were a little more generous, a little more liberal, as to the mistakes and possibly the failures of some others trying to do a patriotic job.

I believe we have to do this job. I do not want this House, though we may think the job cannot be done, to fail to make the effort. We may wake up next year and find that we have not enough food to take care properly of the needs of this country, and that possibly some soldier in Russia is not getting what he should have in the way of help from America to make him a better soldier to fight the cause of the Allies. I do not want us to say the job just cannot be done. This Dirksen bill is just an expression of their attitude as to the futility of the whole job, and they will tell you so. I think we as Members of Congress should provide what the Secretary asked for, and do it the best way we can. It will not be our responsibility then if next year they ask for food and we have no food to give them.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to argue with the gentleman as to his contentions, but I should like to have his explanation of why this work is not in the Department of Agriculture more than it has been. Is not the Extension Service a part of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. O'NEAL. The administration of the job of the State extension services is divided among 48 different States, under the Dirksen bill. The administrators of the 48 States, in order to make an agreement as to farm labor, must go to the United States Employment Bureau, and they in turn will make an agreement with the Mexican Government or the Bahaman Government or whoever it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

[Mr. DIES addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration have failed to deal effectively with the production and distribution of food. That failure threatens to make the food problem the most vital problem on the home front.

We have seen bungling in the field of rubber. We have seen bungling in the field of fuel oil. We have seen bungling in other fields. The Nation cannot afford continued bungling in the field of food production and distribution. It is a terrible thing to be cold. It is far worse to be hungry.

During the last 10 years the New Deal has engaged in a program of planned scarcity. It has carried out this program through the Department of Agriculture, the Office of Price Administration and other agencies. Many believe that the New Deal is still seeking to reduce the standard of living of the rank and file of this country, to prepare the people for a world standard of living as distinguished from an American standard of living after the war. Whether or not this belief is justified, it is evident that the country is confronted by the threat of severe suffering due to the lack of proper handling of the production and distribution of foodstuffs.

Informed authorities and dealers in foodstuffs report that they are disgusted with operations of the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration. They predict the greatest shortages in our history.

The shortages which threaten are the result, as in the case of fuel oil, of bungling, and lack of over-all planning by Administration bureaucrats. It is time for an over-all plan to be presented to the country, a plan based on correct and not incorrect estimates, a plan which provides for proper price ceilings, a plan which facilitates the obtaining of farm labor, farm machinery and farm transportation, a plan which stimulates instead of killing maximum production of foodstuffs essential to the war effort.

I hold in my hand a letter from the Acting Commissioner of Agriculture of Massachusetts.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a portion of that letter at this point in the RECORD:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
State House, Boston, March 2, 1943.

Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Food production is probably the livest topic right now, and I presume you would be interested in learning of Massachusetts' efforts right up to the minute.

* * * * *

Outside of labor difficulties, the most active factor in depressing production in Massa-

chusetts and in the Nation is the price policy on milk that I have mentioned so frequently. I have read with interest and disgust the form letter from Mr. Prentiss Brown forwarded to me by so many Congressmen. I presume the letter was compiled for Mr. Brown by some smart statistician in the Office of Price Administration or the United States Department of Agriculture. I have gotten beyond appealing to the Office of Price Administration or the United States Department of Agriculture for aid to farmers on milk prices. They are going out of business right and left in order to get into industry or some other type of farming where there is a chance to make a few dollars for their families; and they are better off. What disturbs me is that the short-sighted price policy will make Massachusetts and the Nation dangerously short of milk.

When I wrote you last, the local Boston Office of Price Administration milk executives had tentatively agreed on a State-wide adjustment in prices covering over half of the State. The local men, Dr. George Taylor and Stanley Ross, have been very cooperative. They apparently were not backed up by the Washington Office of Price Administration. When it came to a show-down, they actually allowed price increases of ½ cent to 1 cent in seven of our lowest-priced areas. We are still expecting more adjustments but, with labor, feeds, and replacement costs as high as they are, it is pretty difficult to expect herd owners to continue producing under our conditions.

Frankly, I think that the attitude toward the milk price apparently held by the Office of Price Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture is dictated by some higher authority, perhaps directly from the White House office. In the matter of potatoes and many other farm commodities, ceilings have been changed as much as 50 percent to allow for the possibility of reasonable production. In view of the fact that the retail price of foods in Massachusetts is up 20 percent above December 1941, and in view of the fact that the State and national income is up enormously, the dairy industry would normally expect an increase of 10 percent to 20 percent since the beginning of hostilities. The weighted average increase in milk prices in Massachusetts, however, from December 1941, to March 1943, have not been over 1 percent.

As I said, the farmers can do better for themselves in doing something else rather than producing milk, but it has come to a point where 1943 will probably see the greatest shortage in our history, and the sad part of it is that, if and when a shortage develops, it takes years to restock dairy herds.

Thanking you for your continued cooperation, I am

Yours truly,

LOUIS A. WEBSTER,
Acting Commissioner.

You will note that the acting commissioner states that there will probably be the greatest shortage of milk in our history in 1943. He states also that he has read with interest and disgust the form letter from the present Price Administrator forwarded to him by so many Members of Congress. He states that he has gotten beyond appealing to the Department of Agriculture or the O. P. A. for aid to farmers on milk prices. He adds that farmers are going out of business right and left in order to get into industry or some other work where there is a chance to make a few dollars for their families.

I also hold in my hand a telegram from the secretary of the Massachusetts Retail Grocers' and Provision Dealers' Association.

I insert the telegram at this point in the RECORD:

BOSTON, MASS., *March 5, 1943.*

Proposed meat-rationing program calling for substitution of cheese for meat on the basis of 1¾ pounds per person of the two combined cruel hoax on American public. Meat famine, including poultry, worst in history. No meat available to eat this week. Rationing no answer to this situation. No magic in rationing program will correct this meat shortage. Packers, shipping from 10 to 20 percent of reduced allowance to New England, state that reason is financial loss suffered on each car shipped. If they are right, demand that they set own price until meat famine is ended. Massachusetts awarded top amount of war material production. War workers need meat quick. Government's assumption that retail dealers can stay in business while rationing and price experiments are worked out is wrong. Strong trend to revolt against Washington's ill-conceived rationing programs now evident in retail food trade. Not opposition to rationing, but opposition to programs based on lack of supplies of home-grown food that should be available in sufficient quantities to avoid rationing.

MALCOLM MCCABE,
Secretary, Massachusetts Retail Grocers' and Provision Dealers' Association.

You will note that the secretary characterizes the proposed meat-rationing program as a cruel hoax on the American public. He states that the meat famine, including poultry, is the worst in history. He says that meat producers are only shipping from 10 to 20 percent of the allowance to New England. He adds that a strong trend of revolt against Washington ill-conceived programs is evident.

On June 23, Mr. Chairman, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture. In that letter I called attention to his official estimate to the effect that the 1943 meat supply after satisfying the requirements of the Army, the Navy, and the Lend-Lease Administration would be only 8 percent less than the supply in 1942. I called attention also to the deplorable conditions said to exist in Boston and other parts of the country; to the fact that meat was said to be obtainable only at exorbitant prices; to the fact that horse meat was said to have been sold in the leading market places.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 23, 1943.

Hon. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am advised that according to official figures from your office, there is in contemplation for the calendar year 1943 a reduction of about only 8 percent in the total supply of meat available for civilian use after the Army, Navy, and lend-lease requirements have been provided for. If this figure is correct, I cannot understand the acute shortage in meat in various parts of the country at this time. The situation in Boston, Mass., as reported by various constituents is deplorable. I am advised that it is extremely difficult to obtain meat except at exorbitant prices and that horse meat has been sold in leading market places for some time past.

I should appreciate hearing from you at an early date in this connection.

Sincerely yours.

Not until February 24, over a month later, Mr. Chairman, did I receive any reply.

I insert the reply at this point in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 24, 1943.

Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WIGGLESWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of January 23 relative to the meat situation in Boston, Mass.

On the basis of estimates prepared in the Department it was contemplated that the total quantity of meat available for civilian consumption in the calendar year 1943 would be approximately 8 to 10 percent smaller than in 1942. However, it was expected that farm slaughter for consumption on the farm would increase materially because it did not appear practical to limit it directly. In addition, local retail slaughter and sales by small non-quota packers were not reduced. As a result the reduction in commercial meat supplies was about 25 percent below 1941 during the 3 months October–December 1942. During the present quarter the reduction is about 30 percent below January–March 1941, and because the civilian sales in January–March 1942 were exceptionally large, the reduction from 1 year ago is considerably greater. For the past 4 months marketings of hogs have been smaller than anticipated, and marketings of cattle decreased in December and January. These reduced marketings of livestock obviously have not permitted the armed forces and lend-lease to obtain adequate supplies to fill their needs. This has resulted in a sizable reduction of the quantity of meat available for shipment to Great Britain.

The above factors have contributed to the situation but perhaps the factor contributing most is that New England has always been a deficit meat producing area. Before the adoption of price controls, the interaction of supply and demand moved meats from surplus producing areas to deficit areas. Now that ceiling prices have been established for meats and civilian supplies have been reduced, normal distribution has been upset because packers find it possible to sell at ceiling prices in the surplus producing areas most of the meats they have available for civilians. Under these conditions some other means must be found to move meats into deficit areas, but it should be recognized that any measures adopted will be more or less makeshift.

We believe that rationing will result in a more equitable distribution of meat to consumers; however, it will not solve all of the distribution problems at the wholesale level. We are considering all angles of this problem in an effort to find a practical and equitable means of distributing meat supplies, but we do not expect to be able to distribute meat through all handlers who were previously in this business, even though they may have been quite necessary in the meat distribution trade in normal times.

Sincerely yours,

GROVER B. HILL,
Assistant Secretary.

The reply received, if I read it correctly, is an admission that the estimates of the Department were wrong to the extent of over 400 percent, and a statement that this fact, combined with O. P. A. ceilings, had created a problem for which the Department to date had found no remedy.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to expect the people of the country to have confidence in the bureau chiefs of this administration under such conditions.

The representatives of the Department of Agriculture appeared before your committee with reference to the bill under

consideration. They recommended a program costing $65,000,000.

The evidence was far from satisfactory. Secretary Wickard himself admitted on several occasions that he was not familiar with the details of the plan he sought to justify. His assistants were also unable to give detailed justification, and finally admitted that the estimates were largely a shot in the air.

The committee was informed that some 3,000,000 workers had left the farms in the past 2 years, two-thirds of them going to industry, the other third into the Army or the Navy. We were told also that the objective sought was 3,500,000 additional farm workers. Of this total 350,000 seasonal workers, and 42,000 year-around workers were to be recruited and transported from other States or other countries, the balance to be recruited locally within the several States.

The Secretary's proposal included 6 projects—a project of $6,000,000 under the Extension Service for the mobilization of local labor resources; a project of $40,000,000 for farm labor transportation under the Farm Security Administration; a project of $17,000,000 for farm labor centers, also under the Farm Security Administration; 2 miscellaneous projects amounting to about $225,000; and a project for administrative expenses of about $1,300,000.

The plan called for 90 to 95 percent of the recruiting to be done through the Extension Service with the appropriation of $6,000,000.

Fifty-seven million dollars were requested for 5 to 10 percent of the recruiting on an interstate basis, including not only recruiting but transporting, housing in some 345 camps, doctoring, and placing in employment.

In this connection form contracts were shown to the committee for execution by farmers which covered wages, hours, housing, collective bargaining, and everything else under the sun, including the requirement that imported labor should not work on Sunday, whether or not apparently the cows insisted on being milked on that day.

The program called for an extensive administrative set-up, including medical officers, dentists, labor coordinators, labor consultants, labor analysts, health specialists, program analysts, information specialists, labor representatives, and many others—a total personnel of 3,447 being contemplated for the 6 projects.

The program was to function through 6 different agencies of Government, and while $57,000,000 was requested for the transportation features of the plan it appeared from a table, which you will find on page 11 of the hearings, that for the 5-month period ending February 1 for similar work, under allocation from the President, only $189,000 was actually spent.

For my part, it is impossible to go along with the proposal of the Department of Agriculture. In the light of the evidence submitted to your committee it just does not make sense.

The representatives of the national farm organizations, Mr. Chairman, also appeared before your committee. Representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farm Cooperatives, and the National Grange were unanimous in condemning the plan proposed by the Department of Agriculture. They were unanimous in condemning the proposed bureaucratic controls and restrictions; the proposed duplication of effort in the field; the proposed social reforms under the guise of war; the proposed contracts to which I have referred. They were unanimous in condemning the work done to date by the Farm Security Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is a lot of detailed criticism of F. S. A. from many sources in the hearings. If you want an extreme example, I call attention to page 119 of the hearings, to the testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, where you will find a picture painted of drunkenness, debauchery, and refusal to work, by labor imported into the fields of Florida under the Farm Security Administration.

The farm organizations referred to were unanimous in recommending decentralization; unanimous in expressing their confidence in the Extension Service of the several States of the country; unanimous in their opinion that $65,000,000 was altogether too much money.

Subsequently, Mr. Chairman, the proposal before you was introduced, calling for an appropriation of $26,100,000.

This proposal would provide $13,500,000 for recruiting, transportation, and temporary housing within the States and $12,500,000 for recruiting, training, and placement of labor from outside the several States.

This proposal would reduce the total to be appropriated from $65,000,000 to $26,100,000. It would eliminate expensive overhead. It would eliminate duplication of effort in the field, bureaucratic control and restriction, and social reforms under the guise of war.

It would place the program largely in the hands of the Extension Service, in which the farm organizations testify that they have confidence.

The appropriation called for represents, as I understand it, the best estimate of the Extension Service, which is prepared to undertake the suggested program.

There are differing views, Mr. Chairman, in respect to this bill. There may be those who want to go along with the Secretary of Agriculture's proposal. There are those who want to cut the figure to $12,000,000. There are those who want to eliminate the proposal entirely.

Personally, I am willing to go along with the committee report, which has the support of the national farm organizations referred to. I think the proposal is the best which has been presented. Some action on our part is imperative. With the threat of food shortages ahead, with all that they can mean, not only to this country but to our allies, I prefer in this instance to err on the liberal side.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In the light of the testimony of the national farm organizations I am willing to give the committee proposal a trial. I am willing to vote to appropriate $26,000,000 under the jurisdiction of the Extension Service of the several States of this country. I have confidence enough in that Service to believe that the money will not be expended unless it produces results.

The importance of the farm labor problem cannot be exaggerated. Its solution is vital. Important as it is, however, it is only a part of the manpower problem as a whole which confronts the country. That problem cannot be solved piecemeal. Sooner or later we must have an over-all plan, taking into consideration the requirements of the farm, the requirements of industry, the requirements of the Army and Navy—an over-all plan behind which we can throw the united effort of the Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia 10 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, my excuse for consuming any time, even to the extent of 10 minutes, is that while the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations did not report this bill, it has received a tremendous amount of evidence with reference to the problems which are involved, and with reference to the activities of the Farm Security Administration and the United States Employment Service in endeavoring to deal with that problem.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] says that this is a futile bill. I am afraid that I am compelled to agree with him, although I hope that I am mistaken. The gentleman desires to increase the amount of the bill to $65,000,000 plus. In my judgment that would do nothing but increase the futility of the bill by two and a half times. I do not believe that you can deal with this very important problem of trying to procure adequate farm labor for those sections of the country where there is a shortage of such labor merely by making either small or large appropriations. If I felt that you could bring about a satisfactory adjustment of that condition by appropriating a half billion dollars I would be one of the first to signify a willingness to do it, but before we undertake to hand the farmers of this country a stone instead of a piece of bread, so far as this labor program is concerned, may we not just for a moment examine the fundamentals of the situation and determine, as men of common sense, whether there is any possibility that this money we are asked to appropriate will accomplish anything toward the solution of the problem for which it is intended to be used.

Of course, I think there is no disagreement of any particular consequence among those who have studied the subject matter as to what is the cause of our current farm-labor shortage. It is brought about in part by the induction of men into the military services of the country who were essential agricultural workers and by the policy of the War Department in refusing to furlough to their farms, on which they had been accustomed to do essential farm work, men who have been inducted into the services.

It is brought about in part by the fact that the farmers of the country are unable, on account of farm prices, to offer prices to labor which are competitive with prices offered in industry, and particularly in war industry.

By this bill we are not asked to undertake to deal with the fundamental causes of the trouble, we are leaving these causes still in existence, and some are attempting to fool the farmers of the country by saying to them that we are setting up a huge organization of Federal employees with an appropriation of $26,000,000, and that organization is to secure for them farm labor. Where is it to secure it? They say we are going to get 3,000,000 from the high schools of the country, that we are going to take the city high-school boys, who have never had any experience on the farm, who would not know anything about plowing with a mule, or hoeing cotton or corn, or of discharging the most simple farm tasks, and we are going to supply your needs for farm labor by putting these high-school boys to work. Every man here who was raised on a farm, who knows anything about farm operations, knows that except for the most simple tasks, untrained child or boy labor of that type would be practically useless.

They say we are going to import 50,000 Mexicans. I do not know whether they will be able to do that or not. I do not know anything about Mexican labor. I do know this: That they have had this program in existence for several months. The President allocated, months ago, $5,000,000 for the purpose of undertaking to deal with this farm-labor situation and not only the Farm Security Administration, but the Employment Service in cooperation therewith, have been endeavoring to do something about it for some 6 or 7 months.

You will note from this bill that the Employment Service is to be charged with a part of the responsibility under this bill. What has been accomplished in their activities and those of F. S. A. to date? They have imported, I think, some 5,000-plus Mexican laborers and they have procured some 8,000-plus laborers for the seasonal truck industry on the eastern coast. In other words, with this $5,000,000 they have only been able to fill the need for something less than 14,000 laborers. While they have had $5,000,000 they have only been able to obligate approximately $1,500,000, and with that record of lack of accomplishment they have shown with the original funds they now come in and ask the Congress to appropriate something over $65,000,000 to continue a similar program. It would not make so much difference as to what organization of the Department is to carry it on, presumably the Employment Service at least would follow the same practices it has in cooperating with F. S. A.

The question is whether or not from the experiences we have had there is a reasonable prospect of doing anything for the farmers by this sort of program and of getting our money's worth whether we appropriate $26,000,000 or $65,000,000. I should like to give you an idea that I advanced in the Committee on Appropriations but which was declined by a very small majority of the committee.

I do not think we should begin this enlarged program with too much money if we begin it at all. As I said awhile ago, they have had $5,000,000, but they have obligated only $1,500,000, and their operations have covered a period of some 6 or 7 months. Why give them $65,000,000 or $26,000,000? Why not start them out with a modest appropriation of say $12,100,000, $6,000,000 to the Extension Service as contemplated in the original estimate and $6,000,000 to be used in their experimentation in the matter of interstate transportation of laborers and the importation of laborers from Mexico in cooperation with the Employment Service, and $100,000 to be used to administer the expenses in Washington?

Let them work along with those funds for a while. If they are able to accomplish anything of a material nature toward the relief of this situation then, in my opinion, everyone of us will be willing to give them all the money they need and all that they can use in endeavoring to carry it on; and since Congress will be in session all the time all they will have to do in a month or 6 weeks will be to come back and say: "Here is what we have accomplished with $12,000,000; we are asking you to give us more money in order that we may successfully carry on this program." Why is not that the sensible thing to do? I want to call your attention to the fact, especially some of you boys from the South, that the Employment Service which has been cooperating in this program carried on by the Farm Security Administration has been in some sections of the country endeavoring to take tenants and sharecroppers away from landlords where they have contracts that they are satisfied with and ship them into other States. In my district a man representing the War Manpower Commission in the Employment Office at Rome, Ga., had in some way procured a list of those who had registered for military service; who had farm background. He sent out notices to those people to have them come in to see him. He told the tenants of a certain reputable farmer, four in number, who went to the office to see him, that they must go to Florida to accept employment.

They said: "No, we have made contracts with Mr. So-and-So; we are satisfied. We don't want to go to Florida."

He said: "Unless you go to Florida you are going to be drafted into the Army."

I have this upon the authority of a gentleman of very high character.

Now the Employment Service is one of the agencies which are to be used under the provisions of the pending bill for carrying on the interstate transportation of labor. This man was using the office of the Employment Service. Is that the sort of thing for which you want to provide unlimited funds?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. TARVER. We have in this Chamber Representatives from every section of the country. You want laborers in your districts and in your States, and so do we in Georgia. Is there a Member in this House here present today who has any surplus of farm labor in his district that he thinks could be moved to any other district or any other State? If there is, I pause now to invite him to stand and call attention to the surplus labor situation in his district. I observe that not a single Member of the House shows by standing that he has any labor that he wants shipped out of his district anywhere. So it is a proposal to go somewhere else and get the labor from somebody else who does not want to lose it and bring it in to somebody's district or into somebody's State.

Some high authorities of the Government a few years ago indicated—and some of not so high degree have indicated recently, that they propose to carry on an ambitious program to relocate the farm population of the country. They claim in particular that in the South the ancestors of some of our people showed poor judgment in locating down there and that notwithstanding the fact that their sons and grandsons have been satisfied to live there they should be persuaded to leave for more fertile sections of the country. There are those who think it is intended to carry on that kind of program if this appropriation is granted and that at least some of those back of it are not thinking so much of a present emergency need but of this wild, senseless plan to relocate the farm population of the country. I certainly want us to keep control of this labor program, having them come back for more money when they can justify using it, and not at any time allowing them to start a project of that sort.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one-half additional minute.

Mr. SHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I merely want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that we do not have labor that we wish to move from one section of the country to the other, good farm labor, and that we will have less farm labor in our districts if ceilings are placed on cattle and hogs as is contemplated by O. P. A.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer an amendment to cut down this appropriation to $12,100,000 from the proposed $26,100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may

desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

(Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly concerned over features of this bill which would abridge the rights of certain of our citizens to the profit of others. Agriculture as a whole, in spite of the great difficulties with which it is beset, is enjoying its greatest prosperity in many years. The unprecedented demand for foodstuffs is benefiting particularly those growers who, given an adequate supply of labor, are equipped to produce at maximum capacity. This bill proposes to supply such growers with labor drawn from the rank and file of less fortunate farmers, and would permit them to use that labor as they choose, giving no guaranty of fair wages or working conditions, and making no provision for even minimum standards of housing and sanitation. This would be exploitation of a kind repugnant to our American sense of fair play. Moreover, it would make the Government of the United States a party to the exploitation. I think it would be a defeat for the cause of freedom if we now were to withdraw the safeguards which we have provided for agricultural workers and make them mere units of labor at the command of commercial growers. I think the resolution should be rejected as unworthy of this Government.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I expect to support the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] to reduce this to $12,000,000. I think that is about right. I was against the original proposal involving $66,000,000 because it is an entirely new set-up. With all the bureaus and agencies that we have now, they want to come along here and create a new set-up complete and ask for $66,000,000 for that purpose. Six million dollars of that was to take care of 90 percent of the labor, as they estimated it, and $60,000,000 to take care of the 10 percent. In the $60,000,000 and the 10 percent was this new set-up guaranteeing social gains, bringing the C. I. O. to the farm.

Now that is going to make your farmers mighty happy. If you vote to bring the C. I. O. out to the farms, with all its social gains, it will please your farmers, I am sure. The C. I. O. wants to get out there. That is a part of the scheme of the $66,000,000. It is to get them out there and to put these social gains on the farms. As a member of the Labor Committee when the Fair Labor Standards Act was being considered and passed, and I moved to recommit it, which was lost, I stated that they intended to include all labor other than what was just engaged in interstate commerce. I could see it all through the hearings, and they did. They construed everything to be interstate commerce.

My second prophecy is this. Madam Perkins has fixed wage scales in defense areas and they are going to try to foist those on the rest of the country. This is one vehicle to help bring it down to the crossroads. That was evident all the way through. It was evident in the hearings. There were these contracts stating what we had to do with these people, how we had to take care of them, and what we had to pay them and also the camps. It was bringing it down to purely and simply that.

If we want to do anything to discredit ourselves as farmers or people interested in farm constituencies, just vote for anything above $12,000,000 in this bill and you are giving aid to it. Anything above $12,000,000 in this bill helps to bring the social gains down to the farmers, and I refer to the social gains of the C. I. O. That is what is in this bill. There is no compromise.

My good friend from Illinois, the author of this bill, and the gentleman from Detroit who is going to talk very soon, as well as the gentleman from Kentucky, are all afraid that maybe they might do a little falling down and they better give them a few extra millions on top of it just to say that they cannot hang it on to us if it fails. That is all the excuse and all the argument they have: Let us give them a few extra millions here, and if they do fall down they cannot say that we did it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not subscribe to that sort of legislation and economy myself. There are two ways to get farm help back to the farms. Get the boys out of the service that belong back on the farms who can help. Cut this wage scale and get this 54-hour week, which, of course, is impossible under our present set-up. We are frozen into this very thing. If you could get the 54-hour week and the overtime taken off, we would get more of those farm boys back on the farm who went into defense work. Those are the two things that we could do to help the farmers.

Cloistered people do not know what the hot July sun means. You know, these defense workers all work under roofs. People who do not know what the hot sun is in July are in the way out there on the farms. I have been a farmer all my life, and I know that the city boy who comes out there, who is not used to the hot sun, is not worth much of anything. They talk about bringing girls and Mexicans and other people to handle our farm machinery. That is not going to do much good. As a farmer, I honestly and conscientiously believe, noting the reaction of this thing as applied to the farmers, that if we allow anything more than $12,000,000 in here we are giving it away for no good purpose. We are riding the fence, we are straddling the issue. That is just exactly what we are doing. I would say, rather, give them the $66,000,000 and all of their cockeyed theories that go with it and let them repudiate themselves, or else let us hold this down to $12,000,000. Let us meet the issue.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. May I say to the gentleman I agree 100 percent with all the gentleman is saying, and I hope to ask for that very thing.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Four members out of the seven members of the subcommittee that deals with the appropriations for agriculture are with our chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, on this proposal.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I have before me an article appearing in the Times-Herald today which says:

> Chairman Paul V. McNutt, of the War Manpower Commission, yesterday endorsed the use of incentive vacations and incentive bonuses for workers to reduce absenteeism in industrial plants.

I would suggest to the gentleman as a member of the Appropriations Committee that he find out how many farm boys it will take to go into the factories and work for these fellows while they take their vacations.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that you must watch very carefully that people coming in from Mexico are not undesirable refugees who are just waiting for a chance to get into this country under the guise of being Mexican farmers?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I think the gentlewoman is absolutely right. I heard Mr. McNutt testify before our committee when we asked him what ideas he had for manpower to help out the farmers and his whole idea was we would go to Mexico, the Bahama Islands, and Central America and South America. He even proposed that we bring them up from South America.

Of course, we should have an interpreter with each one of them that is sent out on a farm so that the farmer could talk to him, and then he would have to have his accommodations and his sanitation just right, he would have to have time and a half for overtime, and he would have to have a lot of social workers and bookkeepers along to see that he was taken care of.

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has just made another suggestion along that line. I think if we get hordes of workers from South America, Central America, the islands of the West Indies, and from Mexico, and then find they are not worth their salt, then we have them here, and God pity us as to what we shall do with them. And we will have done it all in the name of helping the poor farmer.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. McMURRAY. The gentleman is unquestionably an expert at getting people from industry back on the farm. Will the gentleman explain to the House how he got his son to leave a $125 defense job at Fort Riley, Kans., and go back on the job on the farm?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. That is a perfect untruth. Since the gentleman wants to bring that up—I heard that somebody made that statement over the radio—I will say that my son has always lived on the farm except 4 years attending the Kansas State College, has been farming for himself and living on the same farm for 10 years, that he is 33 years old, has a wife and two small children and he did not leave any defense job to go to the farm.

Mr. McMURRAY. Just as a question of accuracy, then, will the gentleman answer this question? Did the person we are talking about have a defense job last year?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No; not last year. He worked in the winter about 2 months, 2 years ago, for a Topeka contractor, at Fort Riley, year before Pearl Harbor, driving a caterpillar tractor. His family remained on the farm and a hired man cared for the stock but he has never been off the farm the rest of the years. He has farmed these 500 acres for 10 years. It is an effort to discredit me because of a statement that has been made here on another subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I think this bill has a great deal of merit to it and ought to be considered seriously.

The Department of Agriculture approached the Budget and made out a case that was sufficient for the Budget to recommend that the Department of Agriculture have $65,075,000 to do what they thought was an important thing to be done in this country at this time, namely, to regulate the distribution of farm labor and adjust it so that various sections of the country could get help on the farm and increase production this year.

It has been said here that this is the Dirksen bill. I do not understand how that could possibly be claimed with any degree of accuracy, because this bill was written by the 43 members of the Committee on Appropriations and is the committee's bill. It is not the bill of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] or the bill of the Farm Bureau. The committee thought the amount recommended by the Budget for the Department of Agriculture, to be largely administered under the Farm Security Administration in that Department, was too much and cut the amount to the $26,100,000 which is in this bill, $13,500,000 to be administered through the State extension service or the several States, and $12,500,000 to be administered through the State and National extension services jointly, and $100,000 to be used for administrative purposes. This is the bill of the committee now under consideration and represents the amount the committee thought proper to bring here and ask you to appropriate for this important object.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], of whom I am very fond, stated just a few minutes ago on this floor that this bill should be administered under the Farm Security Act. I think he was sincere about it but I disagreed with him. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] says the bill will give no relief at all but that he is willing to cut the appropriation $12,000,000 just to try it out. I cannot agree with my distinguished friend.

I think this bill should be administered through the State extension service, collaborating with the Federal Extension Service and the United States Employment Service, when it becomes necessary to transport labor, the supervision thereof, and the protection of the worker and his family. The local officials of the county extension services in each State are best equipped to take care of this problem under the direction of the county farm agent and its farm committee than any other agency of the Government, certainly much more efficiently than any other agency set up or functioning outside of the State and county, and can also perform the services at much less cost. I live in the great agricultural section of North Carolina, and I know that in my State the greatest care was taken in securing in each county the men who would administer the extension services of the State. These men have been selected from among the best farmers in each county; they know the local problems and they know how to best cooperate and get best results for this great industry.

I regret that I have not time to go fully into the discussion of the fine results the farmers of North Carolina have attained through the Extension Service in our State. In the administration of the A. A. A. this Service has, through the direct contact with the individual farmers and its sensible approach to the farmers' problems, created a cooperation on the part of the farmer never before attained, and secured for this great industry a success unparalleled in the country's history. I insist that the cooperation of the Farm Administration of this Nation as provided in this bill is the best and the correct way to meet this labor problem or any other problem affecting the agricultural interest of this Nation.

Insofar as the great agricultural sections of this country are concerned, the committee thought the proper thing to do was to cut this appropriation to $26,100,000 and then turn its administration over to people who know how to administer it and know the problems they must face.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman that the county agents and local representatives of the Extension Service know about labor conditions within our own country, but how about the importation of foreign labor? Can they do as well on that problem? In my State we need labor from Mexico.

Mr. KERR. This bill takes care of that. This bill provides that the State and Federal Extension Services, collaborating with the United States Employment Service, can take care of the very item of which the gentleman speaks.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri, the able sponsor of this resolution, has said that this resolution and no resolution or bill which this House could bring forth, would now solve the farm-labor-shortage program.

I agree 100 percent with the first part of this statement wherein he admits that this resolution will not solve the farmers' labor problem now, but I can see cause for argument with respect to the last part of this statement, wherein he says that no bill which we might present could or would solve this problem.

To me that statement is an admission of weakness and helplessness on the part of Congress.

I am not so conceited as to think that I have the complete answer to this problem, but I am so bold as to suggest that if the farm boys who are now in the Army, as well as those who have secured employment in industry since December 7, 1941, be honorably discharged from the Army and from industry and be returned to farm labor, that it will go a long way toward solving this farm-labor shortage and it will not require $26,000,000 to put this program into operation.

Any vacancies created in industry by the discharge of these farm laborers, can readily be filled by some of those now employed in our defense plants, who are actually falling over themselves in an effort to keep busy with no material with which to work.

I have been told by men and women engaged in defense industry that this overmanned situation does exist, and in my humble opinion this problem as well as the farm problem cannot be solved by importing foreigners.

For God's sake let us keep something for ourselves if that is possible under the present international policies.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I join my distinguished friend from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] in his concern about our food production in this country. Also, I am likewise disturbed by not only food production, but the matter of food distribution in this country. We are all familiar with the school-lunch program. We remember that we had a food-surplus program. As I understand it, today the food-surplus program has been changed to what is known as a food-distribution administration. I think if anyone knows what is the situation at home, it is our local officials who are charged with looking after the welfare of our people. In the last week I have had one letter from a county welfare board and a resolution from another county board, in addition to some letters from private individuals with reference to what seems

to me to be a rather critical matter in respect to foods. Let me call attention to the fact that I think all of us thought the school-lunch program was a good program at the time for our school children. But here is a letter from a county welfare board upon this subject which I think is rather enlightening. This letter is dated February 25, and it states:

COUNTY WELFARE BOARD,
February 25, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
Minnesota Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Now that foods are being rationed and there is supposed to be a food shortage, we cannot understand why the Federal Government continues to send foods to the counties for distribution to the schools for school-lunch programs.

This week, we all registered for our ration book 2 under the point system. We are told prunes will be one of the high point foods—20 points (almost one-half of a person's points for a month) for 1 pound of prunes. Yet, yesterday, February 24, we received notice that seventy 25-pound boxes of prunes are being sent to our county for distribution to the schools. This is only one of the many rationed foods we are to receive. A short time ago, we were asked to send in a requisition for canned tomatoes—another food we have been unable to buy at our grocery stores.

Our men in the armed forces complain of having no milk and having to drink black coffee. We have in storage over 3,000 cans of milk which we are supposed to give to our schools. Our children don't want canned milk. Ninety percent of the children in our schools come from farms and have all the fresh milk they want and can use at home. Nevertheless, we are asked to push this milk. I realize 3,000 cans of milk would not go very far in an Army camp or naval station but there are hundreds or thousands of counties just like ours throughout the United States. Why aren't these things sent to the men who are giving their all for us rather than being stored in courthouse basements? This problem has been discussed many times. Our board feels it is a farce.

In discussing the program with representatives of the State agricultural office, they explain that it no longer is a surplus program but a diversion program—foods that have been bought by the Government for lend-lease and cannot be sent overseas. It is impossible to explain this to the public The teachers are giving their time to help with registration for rationing and at the same time are asked by our office to come and get some of these rationed foods free of charge for their schools.

We know there are some foods such as fresh fruits that would spoil if not used immediately. Why dried and canned foods should be distributed in this way is the question that keeps turning in our minds.

Anything you can do will be appreciated. Thank you.

Very truly yours,
COUNTY WELFARE BOARD.

Mr. Chairman, here is another from a county board in which they have passed resolutions demanding an investigation of the food administration. They state they have recently had sent to their counties large numbers of canned goods such as grapefruit juice, pork and beans, rationed items, such as apples, peanut butter, walnut meat, and tangerines, all of which are not needed in that county.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the distribution of food commodities has served an important part in the assistance of school children in Blue Earth County and throughout the Nation in times when residents of this county and other counties throughout the Nation were in need of said assistance; and

Whereas a state of emergency in connection with the war effort now exists, and the need for said food distribution has now passed, and some of the items included in said food distribution are rationed items; and

Whereas certain food commodities have recently been sent to Blue Earth County, consisting of grapefruit juice and pork and beans, which are rationed items, and apples, peanut butter, walnut meats, and tangerines, all of which are not needed in Blue Earth County: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Blue Earth County Welfare Board at Mankato, Minn., do hereby protest against the further distribution of said food commodities in Blue Earth County and elsewhere, and respectfully request our representatives in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress to take immediate action to stop said food distribution immediately.

By order of the Blue Earth County Welfare Board.

W. C. MENKS,
Chairman, Mankato, Minn.

It is not only just in Minnesota, but out of the Washington Star of the issue of March 12, 1943, in Virginia, in the city of Alexandria it is stated by the superintendent of schools that he has received 16 cases of canned tomatoes and 15 boxes of prunes with 25 pounds in each box. I call attention further to the following item of what I think is a terrible wastage of food:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 12, 1943]

VIRGINIA SCHOOLS GIVEN RATIONED FOOD AS SURPLUS

Although they are rationed, canned tomatoes and prunes have been included in the foods classed as surplus commodities and given out by the Virginia State Department of Public Welfare for distribution to school cafeterias, according to T. C. Williams, superintendent of the Alexandria schools.

Mr. Williams revealed that the February allotment to the Alexandria schools included 16 cases of canned tomatoes and 15 boxes of prunes with 25 pounds in each box. Canned tomatoes carry a 13-point-per-pound value. Prunes, however, were cut to an 8-point-a-pound value by the Office of Price Administration yesterday. In addition, seven sacks of dried beans, also a rationed product, were included.

Although the commodities were distributed before rationing went into effect, Mr. Williams said that the amounts of tomatoes and prunes had not been decreased from what the schools have been receiving all along.

The Alexandria Department of Public Welfare, which distributes surplus commodities to indigent families, has received no rationed products other than dry beans, with 280 pounds distributed in February.

Up in Alaska some 350 tons of butter were sent and it was left out on the beach and became immersed in salt brine and spoiled. I discussed this with the Food Administration today. I have not been critical of many of these things because I realize that we have to approach this subject with common sense—with thought—but I did suggest to the gentleman to whom I talked in the Food Administration that not only did I think that the production was important but, for heaven's sake, I did feel that the food-distribution agency in control of these so-called surplus foods, if there is such a thing as surplus food—should exercise a little common sense and judgment. It is true that some of these foods have been picked up in the States, and have been diverted to States, a year or a year and a half ago, but some time this fall some of our people are likely to be hungry for want of that food. If it were a matter of ourselves, it might not be so serious, but if it affects the men in the armed forces, I say it is a very serious thing. I am hopeful that in the discussion of this bill these remarks may meet somebody's attention who will try to do something about saving and conserving the surplus food that these people have, if there is such a thing as surplus food.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY TONS OF BUTTER LEFT ON ALASKA BEACH ALL WINTER

SEATTLE, Marc 6.—Businessmen returned from Alaska told today, the Post-Intelligencer said, of a cargo of 350 tons of butter landed on an Alaskan beach and left there through the winter because of a lack of storage space.

The Post-Intelligencer quoted them as saying that much of the huge cargo already had spoiled because the brine in which it was carefully packed froze and broke the barrels. They said the shipment arrived last October from the civilian reserve food supply agency.

The Alaskans reported that much of a cargo of 70 tons of canned pears also froze and burst their containers.

"The thing has become a joke the length of Alaska," the paper quoted one Seattle-Alaska businessman as saying. He declined to be identified by name because, he said, of his business relations with Government agencies.

A high-ranking Federal official in Seattle, who likewise declined to be quoted by name, defended the foresight involved in the large-scale shipment to the distant community. He expressed belief, according to the newspaper, that much of the food on the beach could be recovered and the frozen butter could be reprocessed or rebrined.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

[Mr. HARE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the legislative history of the pending bill is rather interesting. It came from the Budget in February with a request for $65,000,000 supposed to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture. Hearings were held rather extensively in the deficiency committee. That committee modified the bill, reduced the amount, and reported it to the full committee. The full committee, by a unanimous vote, recommitted the bill, and as a result the deficiency committee and the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations then considered it jointly. At that joint meeting a substitute was offered and it came out of the joint meeting by a vote of 9 to 2 and was then resubmitted to the full committee. In the full committee a motion was made to strike the enacting clause. It failed. A motion was made to reduce the amount to $12,000,000. It failed. A motion was made to recommit the bill, and it failed; and so there is be-

fore you today a substitute requesting $26,100,000 for farm manpower.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point for a moment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very briefly.

Mr. TARVER. The motion to reduce the amount failed by a vote of 14 to 18. I think the gentleman should state that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My recollection is that it failed by a vote of 19 to 12, but I may be in error.

Mr. TARVER. No; it was 14 to 18.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This bill provides $26,100,000 to be expended under the direction of the Agricultural Extension Service and in cooperation with the United States Employment Service. Briefly, what the pending bill does is this: It makes $6,000,000 available to the Extension Service for work within the States. There are 2,920 agricultural counties in the United States. This will allow about $230 per month per county. There is $7,500,000 for subsistence, for transportation, and for other purposes for workers within the States, including, of course, the building of necessary shelters and the provision for housing. There is some $12,500,000 in the bill for handling migratory workers across State lines. Five million dollars of the $12,500,000 is for Mexican workers. So we are asking for $26,100,000, including $100,000 for general administrative expenses, as distinguished from the request of the Secretary of Agriculture for $65,000,000, or more than twice as much.

What has been said against this bill? My good friend from Kentucky paid me a compliment by referring to this as the Dirksen bill. He indicates that we have taken away control from the Secretary of Agriculture. That is correct. After all, have we no legislative responsibility? When the Secretary of Agriculture has failed must the Congress then sit idly by? Lincoln took McClellan out when he failed, and put in Joe Hooker. He took Joe Hooker out when he failed at Chancellorsville, and put in Burnside. He took Burnside out and replaced him with General Meade; but the Commander in Chief has not yet taken cognizance of this failure; so there comes a responsibility on this Congress to deal with this manpower problem. You talk about chiseling away the authority of the Secretary in time of war. We have given some of his authority already to O. P. A. We have given some of his authority already to the Director of Stabilization. So there is something entirely specious in the argument that we have diminished his authority in time of war. We ought to do it when he fails, because you cannot trifle with this problem today.

Another argument is that we are allowing 30 days to renegotiate an agreement with Mexico. That is one of the most amazing agreements I have ever read. It mentions the farm security in that agreement. You will find it on page 34 of the hearings. Here is the Farm Security Administration recited as the employer party in an agreement with the Republic of Mexico and the officials of the Farm Security Administration sign it.

I will not give them any more authority. They have been at it since the 22d of June of last year. They have had $4,500,000 from the President's emergency fund and obligated $1,500,000. They have actually expended $189,000 in that time. How many workers did they get? Thirteen-thousand-plus—five-thousand-plus Mexicans and eight-thousand-plus domestic workers. Then they come along after all these months of effort, after this expenditure, and would still have the Secretary retain control. Under his bill he would still diffuse this authority to the A. A. A. war board and to the Farm Security Administration to let this failure and this bungling go on. I am not willing to leave the authority in the hands of the Secretary under those circumstances because we will fail as we have failed before.

What did they ask under the Secretary's bill? Three thousand four hundred and forty-seven new employees. That is one-third of the whole number of workers that they have recruited since June last year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Fair enough.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right, fair enough. Think of asking for that kind of a pay roll? I am not willing to give the Secretary this authority.

It has been advanced here that this bill is a futility. It may be. Sometimes I wonder whether a great many of the things that sort of trespass in the well of this floor are not futile, and I sometimes wonder if a good many things that emanate from here by solemn legislative enactment are not a bit futile when we are dealing with the problem of a great world in chaos at the present time. But at least we must make an effort.

The Secretary said before the Senate committee this month that we are on or may be on the nutrition level of Great Britain. He either confesses disorganization of his own department or is creating a great scarecrow and a nightmare for some purpose or other I know not what; under those circumstances I will not leave it with him. So this bill proposes to put it in the Agricultural Extension Service.

Why? Because they can go into action overnight. There are 2,920 agricultural counties in the United States. All but 15, namely, 2,905, have agricultural extension agents. Nineteen hundred have home economic advisers. Among the 2,905 county agents are 550 Negroes in the Southland. They have a great far-flung organization with a record of 70 years of accomplishment and if they cannot do it, nobody can. At least I am willing to give to them the necessary authority and the funds to make an effort in that direction in the hope that when the snow flies next winter and bellies begin to pinch and children go to bed without their suppers I do not want to have to reproach and abuse my own conscience that I failed. Maybe $12,000,000 is the proper amount, and an amendment will be offered to that effect. I shall vote against it. Maybe this money will be expended and not get the results that we envision at the present time, but at least I am going to make the money available, and then if they fail it will not be the responsibility or fault of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, do not measure the effect of this action today by what is going to happen next Tuesday. Measure it in terms of next November and next December when there may have been adverse weather, when there may have been a diminution from the high production that we achieved in 1942. Then you try to argue with somebody whose insides begin to pinch, whose belly begins to growl because food is not there. I do not want to get into that kind of an argument. I can argue with my people when the Government threaten to take away their automobiles, when they diminish their gasoline, when they ration their tires, when they give them a ration card for shoes, but I do not believe that I can make a very persuasive argument with a man and his family who are hungry. So I propose to stand by the $26,100,000, $6,000,000 of which will go to these counties to cooperate with the extension services, $7,500,000 for transportation, subsistence, and shelter, and $12,500,000 for a cooperative effort with the United States Employment Service, so that if they can find workers to be transported across the State line the money will be there to do the job.

My friend from Georgia asked anybody to stand in his place who had any surplus labor in his State. How should I know whether I have surplus labor in my State? How should I know what they could find along Canal Street and West Madison Street in Chicago, where you will find a great host of people drifting in from the vast open spaces of the Northwest and hibernating there for the winter, then available for the spring, summer, and fall harvest seasons. I worked in the harvest fields out in the Northwest years ago when I was going to college. I had to make enough money somehow or other to buy books and to pay a matriculation fee. So I worked part time out in the harvest fields in the Dakotas and I saw the boys gathered up by the employment services and put on the train to come out and help with the harvesting of wheat. Now, then, they have a great many of those in Chicago. I do not know what the surplus is. How could one intelligently respond to the question that was propounded by the gentleman from Georgia, when he said, "If there is a surplus in anybody's State, let him stand in his place now and explain it."

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Illinois, I am sure, does not intend to misquote the gentleman from Georgia. The gentleman from Georgia said, "If there is any Member who has surplus labor in his district," not in his State.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would be the same thing.

Mr. RANKIN. If you sent a bunch of fellows from Chicago down to my State to hoe or pick cotton, it would be a waste of time and money.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might agree with the gentleman, and certainly that is not contemplated here. Ninety percent of all the employees that they seek to procure under this bill will be secured in the areas where they now reside. The other 10 percent, namely 350,000 migratory workers who move from one harvest field to another, and the 42,000 year-round workers, is only 10 percent of the objective under this bill. That will be done in conjunction with the county agents and in cooperation with the United States Employment Service. But, as far as the rest of it is concerned, it is in the hands of the Extension Service.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that if they will apply the same rule in the big cities that has been applied to the farmers in my section of the country, and take as large a proportion of the people there into the armed services, we will at least have a portion of our labor left; but this war has hit hardest the agricultural sections of the South and West. That is the reason they are stripped of their farm labor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts raised a question about Mexican workers. If you want to speak authoritatively on that subject, ask the gentlemen who come from that area. Ask the gentleman from Texas, EWING THOMASON, ask the gentleman from Texas, MARTIN DIES, and ask the gentleman from New Mexico, CLINTON ANDERSON, who gave a very instructive and informative statement when we appeared in joint committee. They know about that situation. For want of Mexican labor in some of those long-staple cotton areas of the West they lost $4,500,000 in cotton in 1942. That statement was made to us only recently by Mr. Abbott, of the cotton association out there.

The gentlemen from California can testify as to the amount of fruit that was left in the fields and in the orchards due to lack of labor. They depend in large measure upon the labor from Mexico. The regrettable thing is that the Farm Security Administration had to confuse the situation in the first place instead of letting it filter across the line as it has done in other years so as to satisfy the labor demand on this side of the Rio Grande.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman that I said that the greatest caution must be exercised to be sure that they are Mexicans and not undesirable refugees who have become Mexicans just to get into this country. I am not trying to exclude real Mexican labor for limited service. Of course I want aid for farming in the United States wherever possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me summarize. It has been said that we have deprived the Secretary of authority. That is correct. That is precisely what I have in mind, because the program has thus far failed, and it is the legislative responsibility of the Congress now to look elsewhere for better direction.

It has been said that we are modifying the Mexican agreement. That is correct, and the modification must be made within 30 days, for here is an agreement made in which the Farm Security Administration is recited as the employer.

It has been said this is futile. I do not know. I do not know how many workers we are going to get. But I do know that I do not want to charge my own conscience with having been niggardly in the matter. Every Member of this House knows that more often than not I have been on the other side, trying to curtail and economize on appropriations rather than be on the liberal side. But do not forget you are dealing with food, you are dealing with the bodies of the men and women in this country, you are dealing with hunger, you are dealing with the potentialities of starvation. I think I prefer to be liberal on that side.

It has been said that the amount is too great, and an effort will be made to cut it to $12,000,000. I hope the House will reject that proposal. Let us not take that upon ourselves. We have cut it from $65,000,000 and changed the direction. I want to go along with an amount that in my judgment will be adequate in an attempt to do this job, and if we fail, not all the criticism will then be directed against the Congress.

So I humbly submit to you that after the tempestuous and tortuous legislative history this bill has had, and in view of the emergent condition we face, when our own Secretary of Agriculture now confesses before a Senate committee that we are proceeding toward a nutrition level on a par with Great Britain and that there will not be food enough to go around for everybody, it becomes an emergency proposition for us. I charge you well to think earnestly about it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman should call attention to the fact that the Extension Service is one that has been successful and has done a good job over a long period of years all over the country, whereas the Farm Security Administration has been a complete failure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that is exactly right.

The other thing is, if the funds are not expended, I am reasonably sure they will revert to the Treasury because they can be expended only on this manpower problem. If they do not get the men there will be neither subsistence nor transportation involved. If they do not get the men, they will not have to provide them shelter. Consequently, the money that is earmarked for that purpose in this bill will then revert to the Treasury and we will be right back where we hoped we would be in not having any extravagances in connection with this program.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The last proviso of this bill is distinctly antilabor. I wonder why you put it in there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not an antilabor provision; it is quite in conformity, I think, with the exemptions that were made in the Fair Labor Standards Act and in the National Labor Relations Act. Manifestly, the Congress cannot put itself in the position of making the application of wage rules and hour determinations, grievance boards, and so forth, in their application to farm labor, where the day usually begins at sunrise and ends at sunset, or later in the harvest season. You cannot confine it. If we are going to limit farm hours, regulate farm wages and other conditions then of course we may just as well give up all hope of solving the problem of increased production of foods in the year 1943, and let the situation go. Moreover, safeguards on wages and hours as applied to farm labor were written into the Wages and Hours and Labor Relations Acts several years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that I have very much to offer to you in the way of oratory so far as this resolution is concerned. You have heard the mechanics of the bill thoroughly discussed by competent statesmen, and certainly I would not be one to try to tell you about the mechanics of the bill anyway, because all of you are just as competent to read the resolution and reach your own conclusion as I. However, there is one thing that I want to say to you definitely. There has been considerable said here this afternoon, first, about reducing the bill, or the appropriation that goes to make the bill workable and possible. While I have great admiration for the chairman of my subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, yet I can tell you very frankly that I cannot go along with his theory that the bill is no good, but that he will give $12,000,000 to throw away. To me that is far-fetched philosophy to apply to the proposed legislation. I have listened for a good many years to many of my good friends talk about their concern and their interest in the farmer, and they have gone to great length in many instances to say what they wanted to do in behalf of the farmer, and then I can recall a few months later that I listened to a good many of my friends in the well of this House when we were talking about the negotiation of contracts for business, in order to induce business to go ahead and operate and produce because the Nation needed the *n*th degree of production possible, "that business should be helped," and let me say to you, and I think I can state it advisedly, being from the western section of this Nation,

to wit: The great State of California, that our farmers out there have served notice on the Secretary of Agriculture for the last 9 months, that we were in desperate circumstances to produce agriculturally, and that we were heading down the road to chaotic conditions, if he did not have something done to relieve them of farm labor shortage. Many of my colleagues on the floor of this House and myself have gone down there to plead with the men in the Department of Agriculture, and with the Secretary of Agriculture to be a little more specific in action about what was definitely indicated as a shortage of manpower that was developing, and I am frank to say to you that I do not think it would take any super intelligence by anyone to have foreseen what was going to happen to agriculture because of the shortage of manpower, as it applied throughout the United States.

We all know that the armed forces have to have their manpower in order to carry on the requirements set by the gentlemen who are there for the purpose of telling us what is necessary for our military activities, and we also know that if we are going to produce the necessary food for those armed forces to continue their efforts to preserve our form of government, that the whole question is to provide agriculture with the necessary machinery and manpower to carry on the program, to provide that necessary food. We have not accomplished a miracle in this bill I know, and this Congress has been as dilatory in its attitude in taking hold of this thing as has the Department of Agriculture, if you want my opinion about it. What are you going to do with it? Are you going to follow the same line of supine lassitude and nonapplication as the Department of Agriculture, or are you going to do what we should as a legislative body, and at least give the farmer the best that we can? I listened to considerable of the testimony brought before the committee for the purpose of getting this bill formulated, and I do not care whose bill it is. It is the best bill we have before us today to relieve an unfortunate condition, and so far as we people in border States with Mexico are concerned, let me say this to my eastern colleagues on the floor of this House. Do not worry about whether we are going to get work out of these Mexicans, do not let that concern you. We know the various proclivities of the Mexicans; we have used them in the Western States for years on our farms, and in the major instances they have done a splendid job for us; and if you give us a chance to get them back again without any quarrel or unsurmountable barriers, I tell you frankly you will not have to worry about California trying to get your manpower. All you have to do is to keep the screwballs out of the way, and we will take care of our own job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the assistance to the farmer in this bill is very little and it comes very late. The problem of food supply and food production is far more serious than we have begun to realize. The food situation is critical. For the past several months there has been too much tinkering and bungling with this extremely important problem. Not so long ago men in high places in Government were concerned about food surpluses. Even then people in other parts of the world were in need of food. Mr. Chairman, do you realize the demand for food is twice as much as it was 5 years ago? The demand from abroad and for our armed forces and for our own civilians has increased tremendously. Our producers are being asked to increase production 25 percent more than last year—a banner crop year—and do it with 75 percent of last year's manpower, and with less farm equipment and repairs. Why not face the facts? Do we not realize the supply of manpower is dwindling right now and that farmers cannot get near the needed machinery and equipment to do the job? Furthermore I do not believe much will be accomplished in transporting much help from one State to another. If a man is a good farmer in Georgia or Kentucky he will have plenty of work at home. Mexicans can assist locally in places like California or in beet fields in other places.

But, Mr. Chairman, something fundamentally and more important must be done. We have too many agencies attempting to deal with this problem now. The Department of Labor, the War Labor Board, the Office of Price Administration, the Manpower Commission, as well as two or three agencies in the Department of Agriculture all have a hand in it. Mr. Chairman, we already have too much legislation and regulation. What we need is to loosen up these regulations and cut the maze of red tape in which our farmers are tied.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to get down to realities. First, pay the farmer a price for his products on a basis he is required to pay for the things he needs to buy. Encourage him in doing a most important part in carrying this war program to a successful conclusion. Relax the regulations so he may have needed farm equipment and repairs, and fertilizer. Extend the authority of local draft boards in the deferment of men needed on the farms. Let the farmer be recognized when he does a good job just as you do in industry. Let the question of extra labor be handled by local boards rather than through bureaus in Washington.

It is my candid opinion, Mr. Chairman, the farmer will come a lot nearer reaching the goal assigned him, if these suggestions are followed, rather than bind him still further with more and more rules and regulations. All in the world the farmer asks for is an even break. Why not let him have it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this measure is at least a reasonable attempt toward partial solution of a very difficult problem. It has my approval.

I wish to read two short statements from the Niagara and Erie County Farm Bureaus of New York State.

They are as follows:

Responsibility for and development of farm labor program necessary at once. Urge your support of House Joint Resolution 96 as step in right direction.

HERMAN G. AGLE,
Chairman, Erie County Farm Bureau.

Urge you support Resolution 96 of House Appropriations Committee. We consider Extension organization capable of doing a good job on farm labor if funds are available at once.

HARRY O. AIKIN,
Chairman, Niagara County Farm Bureau.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ANDREWS was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SHAFER was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, during a considerable portion of this debate one of the most successful farmers in my congressional district, Mr. Reese Van Vranken, has been an interested observer in the gallery. When the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] took the floor a few moments ago he, almost word for word, reiterated the views of this successful farmer as they were given to me this afternoon.

In substance his views are that this Congress should take off the restrictions that have been applied by the long-haired dreamers in the Agricultural Department and the O. P. A., release farm machinery that has been frozen, give the farmer a fair price formula to include wages, and he will do the job.

The farmer does not want subsidies. He does not want to be told by Washington how to operate his farm and what crops he can grow. Give him decent prices for his grain and his livestock and he will produce. All he needs is the chance. And let me warn this House today that if the O. P. A. insists upon placing price ceilings on hogs and cattle, as is the announced intention, America is certain to go hungry.

There has been a lot of ballyhoo here this afternoon about what the Nation will think unless this Congress votes this $26,000,000 for the Extension Service to find farm laborers. Different Members have said that they would rather vote this $26,000,000 than to be accused of not having voted to give the theory a try. That argument may ease the conscience of those who would vote this appropriation, but you are not fooling the farmer. He knows well who has been responsible for the situation in which we find ourselves today and he will know where to place the responsibility for the lack of food when the famine comes.

This $26,000,000 that is asked for in this legislation will go down the rat hole the same as other millions have gone down the rat hole in recent years.

An excellent demonstration of how some of these taxpayers' dollars are thrown away was given the past 10 days when committeemen of the A. A. A. were paid $6 for every 15 letters and postcards that they persuaded farmers to mail to Congress to demand the continuation of the A A. A. indefinitely; release of 100,000,000 bushels of feed wheat—as we did yesterday—and to demand incentive payments to increase production. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against all this squandering of the taxpayers' money.

Why, up in my district they are already recruiting girls in colleges to work on farms this summer. These girls are all looking forward to a grand time this summer at wages of $50 per month and their board. Little do they realize that what the farmer needs is help to pitch manure and hay, plow the ground, and do the jobs that girls from colleges, it is certain, cannot physically qualify to do. The college professors who would put such ideas into their heads and promote such programs should have their heads examined.

Mr. Chairman, it is time this Congress should give some thought to restoring the self-respect of the farmer. Forget these half-witted theories. Give the farmer a chance to produce by furnishing the machinery creating fair prices. He will produce. He is as patriotic as any other American. He does not ask for subsidies to prove his patriotism. I am keeping my promise to my constitutents, Mr. Chairman, by voting against this appropriation, which has not been justified in any of the arguments made here this afternoon.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

(By unanimous consent Mr. LUDLOW was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, during the 12 years I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee I have never been puzzled by an appropriations proposition like I have been puzzled by this one. I have voted for appropriations of billions without a fraction of the mental worry this one has caused me. It was not the size of the appropriation that bothered me, but the nature of the problem to be tackled and how it could best be tackled. As a member of the Deficiencies Subcommittee I heard all of the testimony, and while I make no claim as to the wisdom of the decision I have reached after considering all of the perplexing features of the matter, I do believe I should tell my colleagues of this legislative body what my conclusion is and how I arrived at that conclusion.

In our encounter with this estimate we of the committee were in about the same position as a debutante with a blind date, the difference being that after the debutante has been with her "date" for a little while she knows more about him than we were able to extract by cross-examination of the many witnesses who came before us. Perhaps it is true that an estimate has never been presented to our committee in more hazy outline and with less definite knowledge behind it. This is no impeachment of the sincerity and ability of those making the presentation, from Secretary Wickard down the list. It was simply that they found themselves in an unknown and untried field and they did not know, and could not know, their ground.

The one outstanding fact that hit us squarely in the face was that there is an acute shortage of farm workers which makes the recruitment of farm labor an imminent and vital problem. How to meet that situation was the question before us and I am sure every member of the Committee was deeply impressed with the gravity of the undertaking and keenly anxious to find the remedy. Food is as important to winning the war as gunpowder.

Between the fall of 1941 and the fall of 1942 a total of 1,600,000 workers is estimated to have left agricultural pursuits. The Secretary of Agriculture advised the committee that 60 percent of the labor that has left the farms has gone into industry and 40 percent has entered the armed forces. He also stated that as of February 1 there were actually 200,000 less workers on the farms than there were on the same date a year ago.

Many and various were the suggestions of means to create a reservoir of workers to meet the farm labor deficiency but to my way of thinking nearly every suggestion carried its own negation. In the absence of a national selective service law—which God forbid may never be enacted—how are you going to get back to the farms the 60 percent of farm labor which Secretary Wickard says has left the farms and gone into industry? I had a letter from home the other day saying that in one big defense plant of Indianapolis six thousand farm boys are employed. My correspondent also stated:

> I was asking some of these young farmers why they came to Indianapolis instead of staying on the farm. The answer from them all was that Dad couldn't pay them more than one or two dollars a day and that they were out after the big money.

If we undertake to raise the price ceiling for farm products so that the farmer could afford to pay higher wages in competition with defense plants we encounter the obvious fact that this would increase the cost of living, followed by a demand for higher industrial wages and that would create a vicious circle.

As I stated, nearly every tangible proposal advanced carried more or less its own negative.

When inquiry was made as to the feasibility of returning farm boys from the Army for work on the farms, Secretary Wickard testified that there are 375,000 in that group, but securing their release is another matter. I quote from page 174 of the hearings as follows:

> Mr. LUDLOW. You stated awhile ago that a representative of the War Labor Board would be authorized to ask for deferments of farm boys.
>
> Secretary WICKARD. Yes; that is, the county war board, the agricultural war board.
>
> Mr. LUDLOW. Have you thought of going a step further and asking for a reexamination of the rolls of the Army and Navy, of the units that are in this country, and nearby stations, with a view of releasing farmers for farm work?
>
> Secretary WICKARD. No, sir; I have not personally advocated that, because it seemed to me, if we could not stop taking the boys from the farm, there was not much hope of taking boys out who had been in and who had been trained.
>
> Mr. LUDLOW. Would not that open up a considerable reservoir of farm labor?
>
> Secretary WICKARD. We have been told by the Army people—we have had discussions on this topic—but they say that they might have 375,000 farm boys in the Army who are still in this country. They cite the fact that they have had difficulty getting men over 38 who can be released to go back to the farms. A lot of them do not like to leave the service. A lot of them say that the pay is going to be less on the farms, when they go back. A lot of them, since they have had some training, perhaps have gotten some advancement; I do not know how much we could do.

So it seems there is not much of a prospect in that direction.

It was hoped that 50,000 laborers might be brought from Mexico to work in the production of this year's crops, but that hope is diminishing, due in part to under-cover opposition of the Mexican Government. Plans to import farm labor from Puerto Rico and the Bahamas are likely to prove ineffective, if not nugatory, due to the fact that enemy submarines have virtually stopped transportation from those regions.

I cite these instances to show the immense difficulties of recruiting farm labor up to anything like the necessary requirements. Still it is a problem that must be met and we have sought in this bill to meet it in a logical way.

The original estimate that came to us from the Budget Bureau asked for an appropriation of $65,075,000, of which in round numbers $40,000,000 was to be for the transportation, subsistence, medical care, etc., of 350,000 seasonal workers and the movement of 42,000 year-round workers and $17,500,000 for construction and maintenance of 250 farm-labor camps and the maintenance of 95 existing camps. This arrangement gave the major part of the appropriation to the Farm Security Administration and only about $6,000,000 to the Farm Extension Service.

There were features of the estimate which seemed to most of us as being unsound and savoring of extravagance. Testimony of witnesses showed an inclination on the part of proponents of the estimate to make over the social order by transferring citizens from places and surroundings where proponents of the estimate thought they ought not to be living, to places and surroundings where proponents of the estimate thought they ought to be living. It seemed to us that this sort of a social transformation was going pretty far in a farm labor recruitment program. It was our belief that the two did not tie in very well together. It was revealed, too, that it was proposed to transport laborers long distances, a thousand miles or more, which seemed unnecessary, and a proposed allowance of $1 per meal or $3 per day per person in transit met with criticism, since the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps are able to furnish a nourishing and satisfying

ration at a cost of between 50 and 60 cents a day.

The upshot of consideration of the over-all problem before us was that it was decided to reduce the appropriation to $26,100,000 and to give the job of recruitment of farm labor to the Extension Service in collaboration with the United States Employment Service and such incidental services as may be required. The Extension Service has agreed to accept the over-all responsibility. We increased its apportionment from the $6,000,000 carried in the estimate to $13,500,000, partially for the reason that the draft has taken many extension workers and it will be necessary to build up the personnel of that service for the heavy duties ahead.

The Extension Service has a director in every State, county agents in each of some three thousand counties, and is in close touch with local conditions and the requirements of the farmers and is in the best position to reach out locally and find the needed labor. With its widespread organization already in existence we believe it is well qualified to handle this operation, especially since it is believed that from 90 to 95 percent of the hired labor to be recruited will be local labor.

Why did the committee eliminate farm security from the administration of this program? It was done, I think, because the committee felt that farm security is primarily interested in social objectives. The committee wants this to be an operation and not a social experimentation. The operation is the recruitment of farm labor to meet an emergency, and the committee does not want any Tugwell ideas mixed with it.

My own thought is that in the committee's action there was an undercurrent of subconscious or conscious disapproval of our bureaucracy's attitude toward the farmers.

The American farmer has been the world's prize guinea pig. In an effort to make him feel better he has been salved and poulticed by bureaucratic panaceas until there is not a spot on his anatomy that is not red and blistered and inflamed. His pigs have been snatched from a normal and useful course of life and converted into soap grease, his cotton has been plowed under and he has been told how many acres of this, that and the other crops he can raise and how many acres he cannot raise under the dire penalty of the law. He has been bossed and regimented and goose-stepped by beardless boys in Washington who never saw a plow, and when his load of grief was heaviest and it seemed that he was the chosen goat of punishment he has been miraculously rewarded by being paid for crops he did not raise! He has been caught in a maze of bureaucratic entanglements, directives, and ukases until he did not know whither to go or where to turn. When I see what has been done to him by the boys in Washington I cannot help exclaiming "God help the farmer!" and I wonder whether the academicians who spend their time practicing their remedies on him will ever come to realize that the very best way to help the farmer and to enable him to perform his full part in the Nation's economy is to lift him from under the mass of governmental restrictions and orders, cut down his taxes and leave him alone. All of this is said without any impeachment of Secretary of Agriculture Wickard. The irrational policies of the Department of Agriculture were formulated before he became the head of that establishment. I regard him as a sound and able administrator, but he has inherited some bad practices and some visionary personnel. I think it is entirely proper that Congress should indicate how it wants this program carried out.

In regard to the exact amount to be carried in this bill for the recruitment of farm labor, I am not so particular. In our subcommittee I proposed an appropriation of $20,000,000 and I assume there is no impropriety in stating that at one time that amount was approved but on more mature consideration an appropriation of $26,100,000 was decided upon. I believe that Mr. W. R. Ogg, director of research of the American Farm Bureau Federation, made a wise observation to our committee when he said:

> I would like to have the committee in making the appropriation make it on a temporary basis for a period to get through the rest of this year, with the understanding that, if this is not adequate, a request for further funds could be made.

Frankly, I doubt whether an appropriation of $26,100,000 will do the job but I do think it is enough to start with. In an unknown operation of this kind, when so much depends on experience, it is in my opinion a sound and sensible appropriation procedure to start with a conservative amount and feel the way, as it were. It often saves a tremendous amount of money in the long run. The important thing is not so much the amount as it is to get started on this colossal task at the earliest possible moment. If a trial shows that the amount appropriated is not sufficient, Secretary Wickard and his associates will have no trouble in finding the doors of the deficiencies committee room. Speed is essential in the passage of this bill if it is to do any good in the cultivation and harvesting of this year's crops. There is every reason to believe that if the bill is not modified in the House it will run the gauntlet of the Senate and the White House expeditiously. In view of the existing emergency I plead with you fellow Members of the House to pass the bill without delay and send it on its way.

In conclusion, I would like to read a telegram I have today received from Purdue University in respect to this appropriation. As you all know, Purdue University is one of the best agricultural colleges in the world. There is none better on this globe. Mr. H. J. Reed, director, extension service, wires to me in respect to the amount carried in the bill as follows:

> We believe that funds carried in present House bill are adequate for agricultural extension service to meet the demands of the farm labor training and placement program insofar as any agency of government can meet the situation in view of present shortage of manpower. Immediate action is imperative in any event.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURDICK was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, for some reason this committee is ashamed of the bill it brought in. I am opposed to this resolution. I am profoundly disturbed by evidence in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies of the Committee on Appropriations that we of the House may be drifting into government off the record. I desire to call your attention to pages 90, 91, 93, 96, 102, and 170 of the printed hearings where at points in the testimony, of extreme importance in the consideration of this appropriation, various witnesses went off the record in their testimony. There obviously were no military secrets involved, and the hearing was closed from the press and the public.

Turn to page 87, and in the opening statement by Albert Goss, master of the National Grange, speaking for the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the Grange, he says:

> Mr. Chairman, when you handed this problem to the farm organizations for recommendation, you handed us a pretty tough job, as you know. We have not had time to form complete agreements as to all details. We are agreed that the present system is not working right, by any means; but we have some general recommendations here which we would like to make, and then discuss possibly some other recommendations which we can discuss off the record or on the record, as to details.

Three pages later, concluding his formal statement, Mr. Goss says—

The hearing indicates there followed a discussion off the record.

Again a moment later, Mr. Goss again went off the record and again on page 91 was talking off the record.

Now, turning to page 93, and reading from a colloquy between the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, who is the chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, and Mr. Goss, we find:

> Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to make one statement off the record?

The hearings indicate that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], did make a statement off the record.

Three pages later during the testimony of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] we find the distinguished gentleman from Georgia making another statement off the record.

Now, to indicate that Mr. Goss began his testimony with the intention of going off the record for some part of it and that this was part of a plan agreed upon among the organizations for whom he spoke, we find, at page 102 that Mr. W. R. Ogg, director of research, American Farm Bureau Federation, opened his testimony with the identical request that he be permitted to speak off the record. Finally, while the Secretary of Agriculture was testifying regarding the urgent need for

action to meet farm labor needs, we find that he, too, asks permission to speak off the record and was given that permission by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I for one am against government off the record. I do not like testimony given off the record and, as in this instance, so given with premeditation, design, and apparently by agreement. What is going on here that cannot stand the light of day? What was it that these two witnesses planned to pour into the ears of our committee? And did pour into their ears, knowing in advance that it was something they would not want to have spread on the record where it could be answered by any agency or person affected. I do not like star-chamber proceedings and the atmosphere in which these recommendations have been arrived at. For this reason, and because the resolution will, in my judgment, defeat its own purpose, I intend to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Members of the House should clearly understand who is in favor of and who is opposed to House Joint Resolution 96 as it stands. It is supported by only one of the four major national farm organizations. Its sole supporter is the American Farm Bureau Federation, which is tied up with the very same 48 State extension services which this resolution proposes to make all-powerful.

The resolution does not have the support of at least other groups according to the record of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, because I read at page 151 that the National Grange, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, and the National Council of Farm Cooperatives do not believe the extension service is equipped to handle the importation of foreign labor and the interstate migration of labor with maximum speed and effectiveness. They endorse the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Federal Director of Extension on this matter. At page 150, Albert Goss, master of the National Grange, reported on a conference among the Farm Bureau, the Cooperative Council, the Grange, and the Federation of Milk Producers, held in an effort to reach agreement on recommendations to the Appropriations Committee. Here is Mr. Goss's testimony:

> We were not entirely agreed on the proposals with reference to the interstate handling question. * * * The Farm Bureau could not see eye to eye with us.

In addition to this split regarding the role of the 48 State extension services, the National Farmers' Union is in wider disagreement, opposing transfer of the interstate farm labor service from the Farm Security Administration. The Farmers Union opposes the prohibition which would make it impossible for any agency to recruit farm labor. I refer to the final provision which stipulates that none of the funds shall be used directly or indirectly to set minimum wage, housing, and sanitary standards.

This resolution, as it stands, satisfies only one out of five farm organizations which, significantly enough, has an exclusive relationship with the State extension services. I submit that the resolution in the present form is unsatisfactory for this and other reasons, and on a vote to approve or reject I will vote against it, not because I am against mobilization of an adequate supply of farm labor but because I want to vote for a measure that will do the job. This resolution, on the word of all but one of the farm organizations, will not do the job.

There is no available labor for farm work located in any considerable number in any State of the Union. This resolution suggests that labor will be imported from foreign countries. If such labor comes in will the county extension agents know it, and will they be able to make arrangements to secure it? Some labor will come in from Mexico, as it has in the past, and will the county extension agents in 2,920 counties arrange with the Mexican Government for it? That proposition is preposterous on its face. In treating with foreign governments for labor, no government will want to treat with 2,920 individuals instead of one responsible government agency.

Will Mexico respond to our plea for labor when in this resolution we give them only 30 days to get out of their contract already existing with the Government, and join the county-agent system?

The resolution contains this further language:

> *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

Mexico will have to let their labor come in under conditions which this committee has written and do it within 30 days from the final passage of this act. I will suggest that Mexico may have something to say about the conditions under which her citizens are to work.

It is certain from the debate that the majority of the committee who brought this resolution in have no idea that through it the farm-labor shortage will be cured. Through the debate you will note that the Farm Security Administration has been condemned, and in my judgment this attack goes further than this resolution. There is a movement on foot to take all appropriations away from the Farm Security Administration as you will note by remembering the colloquy between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I think this debate made that purpose certain. In North Dakota the Farm Security Administration is the only organization we can turn to to put farmers and their families to work who have been foreclosed and dispossessed. Thousands have been reestablished in the United States, and payments to the Government have been overpaid in many instances. This year in North Dakota payments to Farm Security have reached 299 percent of the amount due for 1942. There is not a chance on earth that the Government will lose, and in the meantime families and family homes have been reestablished.

I say to you, as long as you permit Government agencies like the Federal land banks, and the Federal Land Commissioner to foreclose and oust farmers, it will be necessary to retain some organization to put these families on their feet after being knocked down by another Government agency.

I think myself it is too late to do very much for the farmers for 1943. The time we should have done it was when we passed the draft bill in this Congress. Several of us worked for months, trying to get a modification of the draft, but we never got it. You drafted farmers right and left until now farms have been abandoned and herds of a lifetime sold and if you are hungry it is the fault of this Congress and nobody else. It is no fault of any bureau. You cannot criticize the First Lady of the land for that. You cannot criticize Mr. Ickes for that. You can criticize this Congress, because we did not have the vision to look ahead and see what was going to be done.

I hope the people of the United States will not let this Congress escape the responsibility that it assumed when it passed the draft law permitting the farms to be stripped of workers and which has resulted in the abandonment of thousands of farms and beef and dairy herds. We are trying to dodge the responsibility now by passing this act which no one has had the nerve to say will adjust the situation now.

For the crop year of 1943, if there is to be any farm labor supplied it must be done by local communities calling upon business men, professional men, children, and after-hour workers to lend a hand in the necessary production of food. If further draft of farmers will be stopped that will help some, but this proposal to put 26 million dollars into the hands of county agricultural agents with the hope that this situation will be solved, is too visionary even to warrant serious consideration.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, the food and fiber which is produced upon our farms is just as much munitions of war as are the tanks, planes, and guns that are produced in urban factories. If the food and fiber programs fail, the war will be lost just as certainly as if all our warplants were blasted from the face of the earth.

Because of reasons beyond numbering, the operation of the draft, the attraction of the war production centers, many others that might be named, a great scarcity of labor has developed upon our farms. Something must be done to insure an adequate supply of agricultural labor at the farmer's gate or our production programs are bound to fail.

It is absolutely necessary that legislation along the lines of House Joint Resolution 96 be passed as all existing agen-

cies of government to which we have looked in the days gone by for help in the finding of a solution to our all-important problem have failed us. Last year our loss of crops, because of a lack of harvest help, must be measured in millions of dollars—a sad commentary indeed during these days when our country and its fighting men are in such dire need of that of which our farmers are not only anxious to but entirely capable of producing in abundant quantities.

For reasons that will never be fully explained, the United States Employment Service, the Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, the Manpower Commission—every governmental agency to whom we looked for assistance—turned a deaf ear to our pleas. In view of the dire necessity which then existed and the stupendous financial loss that was the consequence of their indifference to our plight, to leave this great question of farm labor to such agencies of demonstrated incompetence would be folly indeed.

After all their puffing and blowing only 3,000 Mexicans were brought in from Mexico last year, so many less than were required that tears rush to the eyes as we contemplate this direct consequence of official nonfeasance.

We must place the responsibility for the production of a sufficient labor supply, Mexican and domestic, in the hands of officials that, when the necessity arises, will not hesitate to cut red tape in the farmer's interest, not in the interests of those who oppose him.

We cannot forget that when 10,000 Mexicans lined up in the border awaiting the chance to enter our country, that the Immigration and Naturalization Service cut all its red tape to keep them out, but that the United States Employment Service would not cut one strand to get them in. We want no more of that.

So, I earnestly plead that you, my colleagues, pass this legislation. Let us put the administration of this problem in the hands of our neighbors, those who know our farm-labor problems. This bill will do it, will end our labor-procurement difficulties, make certain the attainment of our farm-production quotas, do more perhaps than anything else we might do to win this war. I beseech your favorable consideration of the bill now before us.

(Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I have made a canvass of the situation on the farms in my district in Nebraska. I have received many letters from the farmers giving me their opinion of what they think the Congress can do about helpful legislation. When we go back into the House I shall ask permission to put excerpts from these letters in the RECORD.

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks).

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I said on the floor of this House on March 2, that lack of vision and bungling by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Manpower Commission and the O. P. A. have brought the Nation face on with a threatened food shortage this fall.

This bill, known as the Dirksen bill is an emergency attempt by the Congress to set up an organization through the extension services of the State universities to prevent this threatened shortage, or at least to soften the impact against our food production and our national economy. Its purpose is to render such financial aid to the farmer as will mobilize and get to him on the farm all possible labor for his use in planting, producing, and harvesting. I deem it a proper and wise move on the part of Congress and I hope the Members will approve the measure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to the lack of vision, the lack of mature plans by many of the men holding places of great responsibility in the Government by devoting the remainder of my time to Mr. McNutt, of the Manpower Commission, because this agency is typical and closely tied in with the entire labor situation of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I note in the Times-Herald newspaper, of Washington, this morning that Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt has indorsed incentive vacations and incentive bonuses for workers to reduce absenteeism in industrial plants. The news story indicated that it was a bright idea suddenly flashing out of the brain of Ralph Bard, Assistant Secretary of the Navy. It is planned that such vacations and incentive payments would be awarded with the regular pay envelope for exceptionally good work and faithful attendance.

McNutt is said to have told the press conference that such action is one of the several that might be used to combat absenteeism. The general public, when they read of this last "powder-puff smash" of Czar McNutt against absenteeism, will hope that he does not mention any of the several other plans he has in mind in the fear that if he does and applies them they might further impede the efforts of labor to produce the implements of war. If he has other bonuses, we are wondering if he has planned one for the farmers or one for the Main Street merchants, who after struggling with the point rationing system 12 hours a day must spend all day Sunday trying to analyze and make out questionnaires with which they are constantly burdened from the Office of Price Administration.

Does he intend to add any extra bonuses in favor of the white-collared worker who is unorganized and who works at a low salary assisting the small merchant who is trying to hold his business together to render a service of food distribution to the American people who do not live in the offices here in Washington but who carry on an extensive and very important service in the back reaches of the Nation?

And may I divert to say that the Main Street merchant and his employees, by the millions, who are having a part of their salary taken out every week for the buying of bonds; the Main Street merchant who leads the bond drives, who leads the drives for the Red Cross, the salvage drives, who buys bonds till it hurts, who leads in the building of the churches, the schools, the hospitals, who is the nucleus around which the business, civic, and religious life of the community is builded, have about become the forgotten men and women of America. They are not bothered with absenteeism; they are striving without undue complaint to keep the forces and energy of this tremendous effective sector of the home front intact. They are doing their best and more, possibly, then any other group on the home front to win the war and preserve the American way of life. The great group of earnest citizens who have been penalized by Government regulations and restrictions would have a just right to cry out against this added confusion in this latest suggestion of Commissioner McNutt in his further attempt by such a silly suggestion to coddle organized labor.

Laboring men in the war plants have had the advantage of steady work and high salaries. With their sons fighting in the war and their neighbors' sons, they have not asked for and, in my opinion, would not welcome any such a move by the Manpower Commissioner. As American citizens they would not ask for and would not want special favors now at the hands of the Government. The attempt to claim that such a rule would increase their productive capacity is to question their all-out effort at their jobs now and to question their patriotism.

What will the soldiers in the Southwest Pacific and in northern Africa, who are fighting and dying for $60 per month, think of such a policy if they read about it on the battle fronts. Does the Government offer any vacations to them, any incentive payments for extra effort in their fight for democracy? What will the fathers and mothers of these sons think of this last suggestion of the Manpower Commissioner? Will such a suggestion tend to increase the morale of the men who are doing the fighting or of the fathers and mothers who are fighting on the home front in the battle of production and in buying bonds?

Commissioner McNutt has recently asked for and has been given tremendous power over the laboring men and women of America. He goes on the radio and threatens men of certain ages with earlier induction into the Army unless they hurry to a wartime job essential to the winning of the war. He spreads confusion. Now, he comes back holding out the "cookie jar of incentives," in vacations and extra pay to the highest paid laboring men in the Nation.

We shall never get a sane, cooperative, coordinated, effective concentration of manpower production with such a senseless vacillating policy. Some sane, well thought out, understandable, manpower policy should have been given to the Nation over a year ago. Someone should be found who can discharge the duties of Manpower Commissioner with such a

policy now even though it is fearfully late.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

(Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. GILLIE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the House that I have a bill that is in the process of being drafted, which I think will help solve this farm-labor problem, if I can ever get it out of the committee.

(Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, this Resolution 96 is typical of proposals emanating from agricultural wonderland. It is an insult to the intelligence of every Member of the House to highjack the taxpayers for $26,000,000 for a program to further confuse, conflict, and muddy up the waters now badly muddied by the crackpot theorists who have the agricultural program in a bad mess from their social reforms. Let the farmer alone. Take the handcuffs off of him; remove the shackles; give him the necessary farm equipment, a fair price for his products, and he will produce the food to win this war. This resolution should be defeated, unless properly amended, and every man who votes for it ought to be ashamed to look into the face of the farmers of his district. It is time to call a halt to nonessential spending. This bill is just another step in the blueprint of social reform, which the bureaucrats are trying to force down the throats of the American people under the guise of the necessary war effort. It should not alone be voted down, but should be returned to the Department of Agriculture with a severe rebuke for attempting to reintroduce schemes and plans that have already proven unsound. It is about time that the Congress discontinue being a rubber stamp for these impractical, visionary dreamers, that have been sabotaging the agricultural life of the Nation. Let us return this Nation back to common sense and forget these half-baked formulas such as the one transporting workers from one State to another. Where are you going to get the workers to transport and house? And in the bill is $13,500,000 for this item. The only appropriation that should be considered here today is one to provide necessary funds to carry on the work of the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the Third District of California, which I represent, raises 28 major agricultural crops. Many of them rely on itinerant labor. This labor is required to plant, cultivate, and harvest the crops.

Last year there was an acute shortage of labor in this area. After much delay Mexican labor was permitted to come into California, and they did give some relief in the acute labor shortage in which California found itself.

Consequently we are interested in the passage of House Joint Resolution 96, which provides for the importation of Mexican labor We are also interested in another provision of that resolution. That is the provision for direction of the labor program by the Extension Division of the United States Department of Agriculture and the extension service of the University of California.

For over half a century the extension service has worked with and among the farmers. They know their needs. The representatives of these services are usually practical agriculturists and have an intimate personal knowledge of the farmers' problems. Under their direction the money appropriated by this bill will be well spent and will produce maximum results.

We most earnestly hope that the resolution will be adopted in its original form.

(Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the press of last week carried an announcement from Secretary Wickard that he was about to send a mission to London, England, to learn how the people of Great Britain are able to subsist on half rations. Now, the situation we have in this country is an accumulation of blundering, and working at cross purposes.

I want to talk to you a little while about the facts that are within my own personal knowledge and observation. The agricultural experts of the University of Tennessee have conducted a State-wide survey of the food situation in Tennessee. They report that with normal weather this year our food production will be from 15 to 25 percent less than what it was last year. That is due to taking the boys from the farms who ought to have been left there by draft boards that had no discretion and by siphoning off farm labor into industry at $8 or $10 a day wages with which the farmer cannot compete.

In addition to that, in our program of last year the War Department took over 56,000 acres of farm land in two counties in my district. I sent telegrams to the President, and the Vice President because I felt perhaps he could take time off from throwing boomerangs and blowing bubbles and do something about it. I wired Mr. Wickard and the Secretary of War and told them they were getting ready to dispossess 1,000 farm families from 56,000 acres of farm land, and to this good day more than 500 of those families are wanderers on the face of the earth without a dollar from the Government with which to buy other farms. That is what is going on.

Last week I got a letter from one of the more prominent farmers in my district saying he had been trying for 2 weeks to get two tires for the front wheels of his tractor. He finally got them, but if it had been croptime he might have lost the entire crop. You cannot stop the processes of the seasons; you cannot turn back the hands of the clock for growing crops. It is time to put the seeds in the ground now and I think it would be well for the War Department to bring back the boys, who were taken from the farms, and who are still in this country, and put them to work.

Every farm in this country is a battlefield, and every farmer, his wife and children are soldiers in this army which will win this war if and when we win it.

I look upon our food supply as a river system. If you dry up the springs, the branches, the creeks, and the tributary streams you dry up the river itself. We do not get all our beef cattle from the West; many of them come from farms, in some instances only 1 steer from a farm, and from that on up to 10, 15, 20, or even 50. If we are to win this war we must win it on the farm as well as on the battlefield. If you are going to raise food it must be raised on the farm; it cannot be done on the floor of the House or in a committee.

I do not know what this bill will do; I seriously doubt whether it will do any good at all, and sometimes I wonder if it may not do more harm than good, but it is a belated effort to correct a situation that should have been tackled long ago; it is the result of muddling, bungling, and stumbling.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

(Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, as I walked down the aisle I passed my colleague the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN. He said to me: "Here goes the city farmer."

Mr. HOFFMAN. I said: "My city farmer."

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; I am CLARE'S city farmer.

It is very difficult for me to rise today on the floor of the House and oppose a bill brought in by the deficiency subcommittee, of which I am a member, because

I have a high admiration for the chairman of the committee and for every member of it, but this i a forum of debate and a place for differences of opinion. I may say also that the size of the official record would be slim if it depended upon the number of times I have taken the floor to speak; but today I wish to be heard.

This bill measures food by a money yardstick. Do not fool yourselves; it is the hottest potato that has ever been placed in a political lap, and you are going to carry it if you pass this resolution, you are going to accept something that the farm groups could not agree on when they were before the committee—and they are sitting in the galleries today. To repeat, I say again you are going to accept the hottest potato that has ever been placed in a political lap, and you are going to take the responsibility if you pass this resolution. This resolution is for the production of food by manpower, food, food for the Army, food for the Navy, food for our allies, food for the boys that carry our allied guns produced here in America, food for the folks at home, and some food produced will find its resting place on the bottom of the sea.

Mr. Chairman, do not be misled, this is a dangerous bill, dangerous because it involves the food problem. Some regard it lightly and are raising a political flag today, waving it above the Stars and Strips, the Stars and Stripes in jeopardy. Some only hoist their State flag above those Stars and Stripes; some would hoist that flag because they are playing around with one of the farm groups but I tell you I will hoist the flag of relief to the homes of America. This bill is one you had better consider. Personally I would place the responsibility with the Secretary of Agriculture and appropriate the amount requested.

Why not follow General Marshall? What did General Marshall say? He paraphrased Napoleon's remarks that were so ably quoted by our chairman: "An army travels on its belly"; but General Marshall says "food is as essential as powder." What good are your boys in Africa without food? What good are your sailors on the ships without food? What good are your tanks or all your glorious armament, against the production of which not a man in this House raised his voice save one and he changed it since that time—what good are they without food to support the men who must use them? Yes; we have millions for armaments. In our own committee we were told: Do not question the size of appropriations for armament. Who are we to question them? I ask you who are we to question the Agriculture Department? The Nation to date has appropriated $120,000,000 to ration food yet we debate the paltry sum of $26,100,000 to help produce it.

Do not cut the cloth of this necessary activity to fit a program originally set at a figure of 65,000,000 to the humble size of the appropriation proposed. My warning is, give the Secretary of Agriculture the green light for the maximum production of food. Remember crops are seasonal. Time and tide wait for no man, not even the farmer or the Congress of the United States.

But there are those in Europe who are waiting, oldsters, enfeebled, hoping the long winter will pass; women, exhausted, longing; children, emaciated, wondering; will the spring days come to find them on their knees planting and praying? Let us consider it seriously. Those scenes could come to us.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK].

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I do not represent a farming district, but I am a Representative from one of the largest consuming communities in this country. The city of New York. I am here today speaking for the people of my district and the country as a whole to tell you frankly that I am worried when I hear the reports being spread around concerning the shortage of food.

The shortage of food, as I understand it, is due to the shortage of farm labor which this bill is supposed to remedy. We need food. Every man, woman, and child in this country needs food. Our soldiers and sailors need it. Our allies need it.

The original request from the Department of Agriculture was for $65,075,000. The bill before us now only provides for $26,000,000. In my opinion this amount is not sufficient to do a good job. In the first proposal, there were provisions for certain housing facilities and transportation to which I feel the workers are entitled. However, none of these provisions are in the present bill. I feel they are most necessary, if we expect to get the proper kind of farm labor.

I say to you members of the committee, this is a serious question. Congress must do something to restore the confidence of the people so they will be assured of a sufficient supply of food. The amount of money involved is very small as compared to the need to improve the farm-labor shortage.

The Department of Agriculture asked that the experienced and trained personnel of the Farm Security Administration be allowed to handle most of this work; not the Extension Service. I agree with their recommendation. If they are permitted to handle it, I am sure the farm workers will be much better satisfied.

In conclusion, I hope the Members of the House will vote down the present resolution, unless it is amended, so as to give to the Agriculture Department sufficient money to try and cure this labor shortage.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman tell me what States have a surplus of labor now, the manpower that we could get the labor from?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is the question involved in this appropriation. It is to furnish sufficient money for the Agricultural Administration to find out where it can get the labor and bring it to the farm.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thought it took about 20 years to produce a farm laborer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

(Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, I am for the bill as written and will oppose any amendments that will be offered.

This bill is an attempt to lay the foundation for a successful program on the wreck of what has been done up to date. We do not guarantee that the proposed plan will work but if it does not then none will. If by trial it is found that a solution has been offered by this plan, then the necessary additional funds will be made available to carry the experiment to its successful conclusion.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, in listening to the remarks made by different Members who have spoken on this bill I am led to believe that it is a glorified W. P. A. bill for the big cities and a Mexican labor bill for California. It does not seem anybody else is very much excited about it. Certainly we folks from the Middle West are not overly concerned about the bill because we have made up our own minds out there that this is a job which will have to be handled by the States or it will not be handled at all.

On yesterday in Des Moines, Iowa, Governor Hickenlooper of Iowa called seven other Governors together and they talked about this problem. Here are some of the things the Governors of eight States and high ranking officials of four other States decided on after a day-long conference:

> Drafting a series of recommendations that among other things would, recognize agriculture as an essential war industry; release at once all present stocks of farm machinery now in the hands of dealers or distributors and provide enough materials for completion of other units not now finished; grant selective-service deferment for all experienced labor essential to farm production and terminate the present unsatisfactory system of allocation of such farm machinery which sends machinery where it is not adapted.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does not the gentleman think it would be better for those States that are not so fortunate in perhaps having the labor within it to take care of the agricultural necessities to get that labor from some source without going into the gentleman's State and disturbing the balance of manpower that may exist there?

Mr. JENSEN. If this bill is made law, Mr. McNutt and Mr. Hershey will say to the draft boards in the State of Iowa, the gentleman's State and every State in the

Union: "You can go ahead and take these experienced farmers because we are going to bring some fellows in from the cities and from Mexico, from Puerto Rico and other places to take their place; so you do not have to worry any more, just go ahead and draft these farmers."

We know the folks who come from the cities are not much good on the farms. You cannot teach them in 1 or 2 years to be an expert and it does take experts on the farm these days or you do not last long as a farmer.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman stated there were seven Governors present beside your Governor?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman have the number of points they approved in this resolution?

Mr. JENSEN. I just got this from a District of Columbia paper today. I listened in on the radio last night, but the reception was not very good.

Mr. STEFAN. The Governor of Nebraska was there, I believe?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; he was there.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly would be for this bill if I thought it would do a bit of good. But I think it is going to be a detriment. We cannot solve the farm-labor problems with this kind of a program. Remember that even though it is in the hands of the Extension Service, which is a wonderful organization, it will be guided from bureaucratic Washington. They will have their reins on this bill and they will do just about as they please. The Extension Service and the county agents are going to have to abide by what they tell them to do. So I do not expect this bill to do any good. If I thought it would I certainly would vote for it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

[Mr. PHILLIPS addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the first objection to this resolution of the gentleman from Missouri is that the Agricultural Extension Service itself does not feel equipped by experience or training to undertake the over-all task respecting agricultural labor which is called for in this resolution. I have here a letter from Murray Lincoln, the executive secretary of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, in which he states this position clearly. The letter is as follows:

We understand that the House Committee on Appropriations is going to recommend the allocation of certain funds to the Extension Services of our land grant colleges, in order that the matter of recruiting, placing, and housing farm labor may be turned over to this agency.

Here in the State of Ohio we have set up a voluntary committee in which are represented the Ohio State Grange, the Ohio Farm Bureau, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the Farm Security Administration, the War Manpower Commission, Ohio Extension Service, and the Ohio Department of Education. This group has worked out a fine relationship in order to develop a food production program for the State. The matter of handling labor has been divided amongst the different agencies. It would seriously hamper our war effort if this arrangement is disrupted, and further, our extension service does not want to assume this responsibility.

We feel that you should know the American Farm Bureau does not represent the Ohio Farm Bureau, in its advocacy that this whole question of labor be put in the hands of Extension Service.

We respectfully urge that you contact the Members of the House Appropriations Committee you know, and present these facts to them.

From other sources I learn that Extension Service State chiefs are in general quite definitely opposed to the national program of recruiting, training, transportation, and placement being thrust upon them. They are ready to help within each State and have so signified, but in the interest of efficiency in operating the program they think it should be in the hands nationally of those better qualified to handle it.

Of fundamental importance is the resolution's abrogation of an agreement with the Mexican Government on farm labor. This is a serious step and one which the Members of this House should not agree to without a complete understanding of its meaning. Once they have that understanding, I do not believe they would agree to the resolution. Under the terms of the agreement now existing between the United States and Mexico, our neighbor to the south undertakes to recruit and see that transportation to the United States line is provided for Mexican agricultural workers as certification for their need in this country is shown to the Mexican authorities. Under the terms of the agreement, a minimum wage of 30 cents an hour is provided, the barest sort of shelter and health requirements, and the guaranty of payment for 75 percent of the time the Mexicans are on the scene to which they have been assigned for work, whether or not they are actually given work to occupy their full time.

Several thousand Mexicans have been brought to this country—primarily to California—under the terms of the agreement. The Farm Security Administration was asked by the Mexican Government, by the Manpower Commission, and by the Secretary of Agriculture to handle the importation of farm workers. It did not seek the job. The job was thrust upon it. The same is true of the handling of the recruitment and transportation of domestic farm workers, which this agency has carried on in conjunction with the War Manpower Commission.

Though there have been some unsatisfactory occurrences in the operation of this Mexican program—as there are bound to be in the operation of any new program—the Mexican Government has, in general, found it to be very satisfactory. It is certain that the Mexican Government will not enter into another agreement lowering or removing the standards set in the present agreement, as the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri indicates will be the procedure. In fact, the Mexican Government cannot fail to regard this resolution as a threat to the minimum standards provided in the current agreement and a threat, with its proviso that the new agreement must be negotiated within 30 days, phrased so as almost to be insulting. This resolution, in short, will definitely work against good neighborliness in a period of food-production crisis in which we need good neighborliness more than ever.

The resolution is aimed to provide the cheapest possible labor for the big corporate farmer. It flies in the face of economic facts and is the worst possible way to attempt a farm-labor-stabilization program—unless the author of the resolution wants us to embark upon a type of farm operation in which we keep farm workers in the fields at the point of the bayonet. The family type and smaller farmers—upon whom we must count for the major part of any expansion in food production—see that if they are to survive the big corporate farmer should be made to pay decent wages to his farm workers. It is in large part because of the cheap labor he has had at his disposal that the corporate farmer has extended his holdings so much at the expense of the family farmer who employs only his own and his family's labor.

The discrimination against the Farm Security Administration—the one agency of government which has had some experience in this field—which is provided in the resolution is a classical example of the success of the smear technique. I am satisfied that the charges against the Farm Security Administration are most of them wild and unfounded. I think elimination of Farm Security from this picture is short-sighted and disastrous. The people of that organization are the only ones who have dealt with this problem—through their labor camps and otherwise—over a considerable period. They know how to handle farm workers in this food-production crisis.

The National Grange, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, and the National Council of Farm Cooperatives do not think the Extension Service should handle this farm labor problem. Neither does the National Farmers Union. Nor does M. L. Wilson, the Director of the Extension Service. I hope the resolution is defeated and that the amount of money asked for originally by the Secretary of Agriculture to do the job is restored.

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, my good farmer friend from the city of Detroit [Mr. RABAUT] and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK], who said we are going to be short of food unless this bill goes through, forget that the appropriation of money does not produce food. You have to plant the

seed and take care of the crop and harvest it before you have food, and that cannot be done unless you have competent farmers.

I recall, too, very distinctly that when we grew some food over on the western side of Michigan that we wanted to take down to Detroit they would not let us in there until we paid the union $25 for the exercise of our right to deliver that food to the hungry people of Detroit. We do not care very much if some of those union racketeers do get hungry.

The farmer needs relief all right, but he is not going to get it this way. What they should have done before and what we should do now is let the man who is on the farm, who knows how to farm, stay there, or if he has been taken into the Army, put him back on the farm.

FOREIGNERS MOVE IN AS FARM BOYS LEAVE TO FIGHT

Alive at last to the fact that not only will the people of these United States go hungry but that we will be unable to supply our own fighting men and the armies of our allies with the food needed to enable them to carry on the war, the administration now seeks to take belated action to prevent this major disaster. For months it has been obvious that the administration's policy of enticing expert farm workers into defense plants by means of high wages, added to the drafting of farm boys for armed service, would necessarily create a food shortage.

The dumbest bureaucrat must have known, if he paused to think, that a food shortage would destroy the foundation upon which our war effort is based. Nevertheless, after stripping the farms of the expert workers, the administration continued to deny to the American farmers the farm machinery needed to supplement the work of the few who remained.

Now it comes in with a joint resolution providing for an appropriation of some $26,000,000 to be used to pay the—

expenses necessary for the recruiting, training, and placement of workers needed for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war (including agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States).

The net result of the administration's policy is that the farm boys of America are to be drafted for fighting on some fifty-odd fronts through the world while unskilled workers from cities—yes; and from foreign countries—are to be recruited, trained, and transported to the home jobs made open by the drafting of the farm boys. Labor camps are to be erected, other necessary housing and shelter facilities are to be made available or acquired for the use of these workers.

To take the place of the expert farm worker who has been sent to fight on foreign soil the farmers' tax money and the tax money of other citizens is to be used, among other purposes, to bring in a laborer from a foreign country, who, after training, will be expected to do the work which the farmer's son would have done had he remained at home.

The average American citizen of sound judgment and good sense would have adopted the policy of retaining upon the farms those familiar with farming conditions, with the manner and the methods of goods farming, and of supplying the farmers with equipment necessary to increase production.

Unfortunately, here again instead of doing the simple, the obvious thing of using the men available for the performance of the job for which they were most familiar, giving them adequate farm machinery, this administration takes them from the farm and substitutes in their place a man from the city who has to be transported, trained, and housed at public expense, or worse yet, takes a worker from a foreign country, brings him to America, at public expense, and places him in the farm boy's home.

To me such a policy does not make good sense and does not tend to create unity.

I suggest you let the farm workers stay on or return to the farms and forget this idea that you can pick up some fellow from some other country or from the city and overnight make him into a farmer. It cannot be done, as you will discover.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. The racketeers will charge me $10.20 instead of $9.41 for driving a truckload of food into the city of New York. I do not yield for any raise in the price that goes to the labor racketeers for tribute so that I may put food into the city.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The gentleman made a misstatement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When your people get hungry enough they will open the gates of the city and let the farmers come in with the food they have. Then you will not be hungry any longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to make clear that I do not think that the present resolution under discussion will more than scratch the surface of the farm labor problem; nevertheless I do think it is a step in that direction and because of that shall vote for the resolution.

It is, however, my sincere conviction that legislation of this nature, while perhaps helpful in some small degree, can never do what we must have done if we are to solve the farm labor problem to any successful degree.

In every mail there comes to me letters from farmers of my district, pleading for help that I cannot give to them toward aiding in the deferment or the discharge from the service of their sons who have been their mainstays upon the farms and are absolutely essential to the successful operation of that particular farm.

As I stated to begin with, this proposed legislation offered today merely scratches the surface. In my opinion, ladies and gentlemen, if we are to do any good for America and agriculture today, and by so doing do good for our war effort, we must demand that agriculture be treated as an essential war industry and give it such rating.

We must give to agriculture immediately sufficient tools with which to work and not leave it to any bureaucrat to determine the percentage of steel that can be allocated for the production of any farm machinery, without which food cannot be produced. We must furnish to agriculture in some way sufficient labor to get the job done. How are we going to furnish agriculture with that labor? Two weeks ago I asserted on the floor of the House, and proved my assertions to be the fact, that we have 3,000,000 men and women on the civil-service rolls, men and women drawing more total salary today than all of the total members of the armed forces of America. I suggested at that time that 1 out of every 6 of those 3,000,000 people be eradicated from the civil-service rolls and that this could be done without harming the war effort in the least. I suggested then that this prospective 500,000 men could then go into the Army and war plants and replace an equal number of farm-trained men who have been mistakenly inducted into the service, men who should never have left the farms but should have remained there to produce the food we must have unless our victory in this war be imperiled.

Last September 23, on the floor of this House, I made this statement:

Have you momentarily paused and thought of what may come to our beloved Nation in a few years' time if too much farm labor is stripped from the farms, if experienced farmers continue to be taken in the draft, if dairy cows and brood sows go to the slaughter pens rather than to remain on the farms to further our production? We have plenty of food today. How about tomorrow?

Mr. Chairman, tomorrow is here with us as we are debating this question.

In that same speech on September 23 I raised the issue of the tremendous number of auction sales that were taking place at the time in my congressional district. I further stated in that particular speech:

How can the farmer ever compete for labor nowadays if he cannot obtain sufficient for his products to justify the wages farm labor demands?

I would further like to quote at this time, Mr. Chairman, from a letter received from a former Congressman from the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota, dated March 12, 1943. The Honorable Frank Clague writes:

I am taking the liberty of writing you this letter to give you first-hand views of the farm labor situation in our county, and I think the same will apply to every county in your district. All our draft boards prior to November 1 were compelled to take a good many men from the farms, particularly the sons of farmers who should have been left

on the farm. Since November 1 the papers have been full of statements that many of the farm boys who were badly needed at home would be returned to work on their father's farms or the farmers who needed help, provided a proper showing could be made. I have made out a good many applications for farmers for the purpose of getting boys released, but I find that it is practically impossible to get any releases for boys who are now in the service, excepting for those who are now over 38 years of age. Our farm labor situation is very critical. It is just next to impossible to find a man who is now willing to work on the farm. Plants that are manufacturing airplanes, ships, and other supplies for the Government are paying so much higher wages than farmers are able to pay and for very short hours that practically no farm help can now be secured. Most of our farmers carry on mixed farming Over 50 percent of our farmers have a good many cows and hogs and are feeding much livestock. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary to work more than 10 hours a day and to find a man who is willing to work on a farm is next to impossible.

I want to give you a couple of illustrations. Joe Guetter, one of our most successful farmers in Redwood County, who carries on a farm of about 600 acres near Wabasso in our county, all land being owned by himself, who has 30 milk cows, 200 to 300 hogs, also feeds a number of feeders, has 2 tractors, threshing machine, raises 125 acres of corn each year, probably this year will have 100 acres of flax; he is about 70 years of age, has 2 boys at home, one 16 years of age and one 18 years of age. The 18-year-old boy is in poor health and unable to do very much work. He had a son who was nearly 31 years of age who was taken in the October call from our county and is now located at Camp Adair, Oreg. This son, who is now in the Army, was the mainstay on his father's farm. I know him well. He is a wonderful farmer. He is a first-class mechanic. He thoroughly understands the handling and caring for farm machinery. He knows how to run a threshing machine and do all the repair work on the same.

Along in January I made out for Mr. Guetter several affidavits and got a statement from the chairman of the draft board of Redwood County that he is in great need of the return of this son on his farm for the reason that he cannot get other help. The father has probably driven 150 to 200 miles looking for a good man. The Government agency at Redwood Falls cannot find him a man. Our county agent has tried, but on February 8 we received the letter from the personnel officer of the company in which his son is in stating that it is impossible to discharge the son Anthony, and in the last paragraph of the letter (you will note) it says, "Contact your county agent." Our county agent is working just as hard as I am to find men who are able and willing to work on the farm but they cannot be found.

I have many similar cases to this, but we are unable to get any releases. The Government is asking all farmers to produce more, to keep more cows, to raise more chickens and hogs and fat cattle, but we can't get the men to take care of them, and unless Mr. Guetter can secure the release of his son it will simply mean that he has got to dispose of most of his cows and hogs and cut down his farming. If he cuts down his farming it is impossible to get his land farmed because no adjoining owners can take on more land to farm.

I had a farmer in yesterday afternoon who is also one of our best farmers, who carries on 320 acres, has for several years had 30 cows and now has 30 milk cows on his farm. Twenty-four of these cows are being milked now, and all 30 will be milked after June 1 during the summer. He is one of the best farmers in the county, and he has tried everywhere to find farm help. Last June the draft board took his man who had been with him for 3 years, but we have been unable to get him released and got our letter from the officer in charge saying, "Get school boys and other help." Other help cannot be found who will do dairy work. I do not know whether there is anything that you and the other Members of Congress in Minnesota can do to get some of these boys released to return to their homes to help us produce these needed crops, but if we can't get some of them returned many of our cows will have to go to the slaughter houses and much less crops can be raised. It is almost impossible for farmers to get extras for a machine if it breaks down and with green help it is almost impossible to get the machinery fixed.

I saw a letter from a farmer's son who is now at a camp in the Army in the United States who stated that he will be glad to come home and made the statement that he is not working over an hour a day in the camp where he is located. If we are going to feed the Army and feed our people we have got to have help on our farms. You are a practical farmer and know that a good farm hand who is able to care for stock has to have some experience and that one good man on a farm is worth three or four poor ones.

Kindly give this matter your consideration.

Best wishes,

Yours truly,

FRANK CLAGUE.

Let me also read you extracts from a letter written to me just a few days ago by a gentleman in my congressional district. He states, among other things:

I am 79 years old and unable to do farm work. My wife is 61 years old and not feeling well. There is no farm help to be obtained for steady employment. The only help obtainable are floaters and are not dependable.

My son, who was inducted into the Army last April a year ago, or about a year ago, was at that time renting from me 240 acres of land. He had farmed this 240 acres for two seasons and when he was inducted he was married and also the owner of a full line of farm machinery, most of which was power machinery. He also owned 19 head of cattle, 12 milk cows, some young stock, 6 brood sows, and some chickens. His two brothers, who farm adjoining farms of 160 acres each, have tried to help take care of the stock of their brother who is in the service.

It has come to the point now where this brother's livestock must be sold and also considerable part of the livestock of his two brothers who cannot secure sufficient help to farm with. This son of mine is 27 years of age and married, is a very efficient and reliable farmer, and is urgently needed at home to operate the 240-acre farm, and in my opinion can do more for his country on that particular farm at this time than he can in the armed forces

Mr. Chairman, spending $26,000,000 upon this problem may scratch the surface but it will not do the job. It will not bring to the farms these men who know how to farm, who know what it is to get up at 4:30 in the morning and work until 9 o'clock at night before they can call it a day. This bill will not solve the problem of the Nation as far as the food situation is concerned.

We in the United States of America must decide here in Congress whether the production of food is essential to victory. If that production of food is decided to be essential to victory, then let us treat the farmer just as we treat the defense plants by giving him machinery that he needs to work with and the labor that he must have to produce this food. Otherwise, victory will not come for many a year.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I address myself particularly at this time to the effort made by my respected friend the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] and my respected friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], by which they would substitute for the present bill the proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture. I was much interested in hearing the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky express amazement that the Secretary of Agriculture should be charged with incompetency. He expressed amazement over that. I thought that was such a generally well recognized fact that everybody knew it, and to say that it provoked amazement to me is indeed startling.

Our issue today is simply this: Do we want to use a reasonable, practical method such as that suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], or do we want to approve a social-reform measure such as the Secretary of Agriculture proposed. Boiled down, that is just what it amounts to. The Secretary of Agriculture came before the committee and urged a plan which had every possible social reform incorporated in it. One of my distinguished friends on the majority side facetiously probably, but nevertheless pointedly, asked the Secretary of Agriculture, as he scanned all the social requirements included in his proposal, whether the Secretary had not forgotten to provide pink pajamas for the farm workers that were brought onto the farm. That probably, better than anything else, characterizes the Wickard proposal. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], on the other hand recognizing the need persuaded, mark you, persuades the majority that his proposal was better than that provided by the Secretary of Agriculture. That is no small job. Any man on the minority side who can put together a practical proposition that has sufficient merit in it to persuade the majority to accept his proposition in lieu of that of the Secretary of Agriculture must have something of great merit about it.

The thing that impresses me is that the only Members on the majority side whom I have heard contending for the position of the Secretary of Agriculture were two gentleman. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] charges that we are pulling down the flag and putting up some State emblem in its stead. I must confess that is imagination carried to a great degree.

That was his argument against the Dirksen proposal. It is neither persuasive nor convincing.

Mr. Chairman, I have always firmly believed that nature was more dependable than the New Deal in providing food for the American people. I have always vigorously rejected the notion that any man, even an indispensable one, could plan better than the providence of God. I have always earnestly prayed, "Give us this day our daily bread." I confess, Mr. Chairman, these tenets are a part of a very plain, a very simple, a very homely faith. They may not appeal to some men. But to me, they have been sustaining, especially sustaining when subjected to the white heat of experience. And, I should add, they have been more than confirmed as contradictory experiments have proved to be both delusive and disastrous.

Were I tempted, Mr. Chairman, to entertain any doubt of the value of this faith, that temptation was swept away by the helplessness of Mr. Wickard and his staff of specialists in the face of a real and not a fanciful problem. I fail to find anything other than helplessness in the proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture which was intended to meet the pressing needs of the farmer today. What has become of the blueprints of the planners? Only a short time ago we heard much of an ever-normal granary, and yet today that ever-normal granary threatens to be as bare as the cupboard of Mother Hubbard herself. Is there an excuse for the dire conditions which we face as the prospect of food shortages are admitted by the Secretary?

Here we are at the planting season with nothing at hand to give any hope of how the farms are to be manned other than an impractical, and certainly imperfected, proposal of the Secretary which every farm organization has rejected. What excuse can there be for such delay, for the failure to find a workable solution for the problem? I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the agricultural planners, of and from whom we have heard so much, and for whom we have paid so generously out of the Public Treasury, offer us nothing other than an utter helplessness in our time of need.

For more than 10 years, Mr. Wickard and his predecessor have had a field day with the farms of America. It has not been an amateur affair. Far from it. It has been highly professional, with an imposing array of impressive titles and impressive salaries. Their promises were fulsome. We were led to believe that what nature failed to do they would do, what the farmer did not know how to do, they could do. Every conceivable economic experiment that the mind of a man might turn to was literally foisted on the farmer by a band of star-gazing theorists. Regulation was piled on regulation until the state of our farmers was not altogether unlike a sovietized fellow traveler. Our harvests no longer were to depend on the providences of God and the energy of the men and women on the farm, but on the deductions of mathematically minded manipulators. Nor was the rigidity of these deductions relaxed when the grim specter of famine stalked hideously across the gory and blood-drenched fields of Europe. With the hungry of the world crying piteously for bread, the American farmer was penalized if he planted more wheat than the mathematicians had hit upon as his portion of supplying a dire world need.

As I reflect upon these policies and as I contemplate our present plight, I fail to find the security which was promised in exchange for our liberty. Have I overstated the facts? I submit, Mr. Chairman, these are not my deductions. I acknowledge they are faulty in one respect—they may not be sufficiently graphic and complete to give the entire detail of the ineptitude of the Department of Agriculture to solve in a practical and common-sense way the problems of the American farmer. But what is lacking in description is more than made up for by the accuracy of the facts. One thing is certain. After all its delving into theories and its experimental drivel, the Department of Agriculture tells the American people that it has only an impractical, an unwieldly and costly proposal with which to ward off hunger.

I find one striking similarity, Mr. Chairman, in the proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture with what I believe to be a basic and general mistake of the administration now in power. That mistake is the false notion that spending money is the only way to solve every problem with which we may be confronted—that anything can be accomplished by drugging and debauching with gratuities and subsidies—if only the excesses of a Treasury orgy are made attractive. That notion has become so fixed and general that we appear to place very little dependence on the resourcefulness and on the ruggedness of a free people to grapple with perplexing problems. Make an appropriation, has become the cure-all for our ills. The popularity of such a policy is beyond question. A lavish spender of money, whether it be his own or that of others, always finds a ready company of companions. But the popularity of the policy provides no proof of its soundness. Measured in terms of results, so far as the operations of the Department of Agriculture are concerned, I believe the American people will find little nutritive value at this time in the mistaken notion. I confess, Mr. Chairman, I have fixed convictions on this phase of our present problem and of many other problems as well. I contend we must recur to first principles, to basic and simple truths—truths which may not at the moment be popular, but which time will prove to be substantial. If we are to do this, we must change our policy, we must evaluate proposals not on the basis of how much can be spent on them, but on the basis of what they can accomplish at a time when every nerve and fiber of our being are strained and tense.

As I reflect upon the course followed by the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with the food supply for our people, I cannot dismiss from my mind the unexplainable delay on his part in approaching the problem. It would be manifestly unfair, however, to place the whole blame for this delay on his shoulders. Others share it with him. It goes beyond one department or agency of the Government. The fault lies in the failure of the administration now in power to take into proper account all factors involved in the prosecution of the war and to fit these factors together into a composite whole. One department pursues one course. Another department follows the opposite tack. One agency makes one ruling. Some other agency contradicts it. Directives from this, that, and another official are as plentiful as the quills upon a fretful porcupine. With these conditions prevailing it is no wonder that we find ourselves at the planting season, faced as we are with a necessitous demand for increased farm production, with no practical program with which to assure our people that their needs will or can be supplied. The responsibility of leadership entails more than the projection of plans. It carries with it the willingness to make decisions, no matter how unpopular they may be, and the courage to put these decisions into execution.

I find encouragement, Mr. Chairman, in one thing, as I reflect further upon the proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture, and that is the attitude of men of both political parties toward it. The Secretary failed to convince either Democrats or Republicans that his proposal had merit. Its faults were so glaring and its worthlessness so obvious that even administration defenders shied away from it. Certainly no better grounds could be found for its complete rejection, and for the criticism which has been directed against it, than the unwillingness of men who usually support administration policies to defend it wholeheartedly. And certainly no fairer appraisal of the failure of the administration now in power to meet our farm needs could be made than that which has been made of the Secretary's proposal by outstanding Democrats.

We have been told that this plan of the Secretary's should be adopted, despite its acknowledged impracticality, simply because of the place which the Secretary occupies in the Cabinet, and the approval which has been given to the plan by the President. It has been suggested that the responsibility will be on our shoulders if our people fail to find food. I cannot subscribe to such suggestions. I refuse to be cowed by the threat of reprisals. Ours is a responsibility, and we would indeed be lacking in courage were we to implement an unworkable program by the appropriation of funds simply because of our fear of what the future holds in store. I am of the opinion that our responsibility goes much deeper than the closing of our eyes to the weakness of a proposal simply because it may have Executive endorsement.

Such a course would mean that we lent our aid to the raising of false hopes and contributed the bitter disappointment of a disillusionment which we have every reason to believe would follow were we to accept the plan offered by the Secretary. If hunger comes, the fault will

lie in one place. And it is not in the Congress.

The committee of which I am a member has discarded the Secretary's plan and has reduced very materially the amount of money requested by him. We have frowned upon the emphasis which he placed on the social objectives in his plan. We want our farmers to farm—not to found a fairyland. We have rejected the need for an army of supervisors and administrators such as the Secretary sought. We have availed ourselves of existing agencies rather than creating a new one, and have used the agencies nearer at home rather than one here in Washington. We have disapproved the glorified excursions of prospective farm hands and their families, such as were contemplated by the Secretary. In a word, we have rejected the visionary scheme of the Secretary and substituted for it a practical and workable program which we believe will be of assistance to the farmers of America as they are called upon to furnish the food for our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] such time as he may desire.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COFFEE was granted permission to extend his own remarks.)

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, a vote for this measure—House Joint Resolution 96—is, in my opinion, a vote for hunger and starvation, a vote to handicap our food production by paralyzing the United States Department of Agriculture in its efforts to mobilize and transport farm labor in considerable numbers from one part of the country to another as needs arise. It is true that the measure appears to have the support of one large farm organization, but that support is based upon a bitter hatred of any and all labor standards, either in agriculture or in industry. Spokesmen for this organization will fight to the last ditch to keep agriculture immune from all labor standards, however low they may be, to keep farm labor exempt from such standards and their enforcement, unprotected against the power of commercialized agriculture to dictate wages, hours, living conditions, sanitary facilities—yes, and even whether he shall have a well to drink from or must drink from the ditches. This has been their historic position. Any move to extend to farm labor the minimum protections given to industrial labor has been defeated in peacetime with the excuse that such legislation was not "practical," that farm prices were so low that farmers could not afford to compete with industry in the payment of decent minimum wages, that anyway, it was unnecessary because each and every hired hand on every farm in America was practically a member of the family and was treated like a favorite son.

Commercialized agriculture in those peace years dug its own pit, and now in these war years it has fallen into that pit itself. Farm labor, wages and working and living conditions have been so low that, as the great and distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin said a few months ago in introducing bills for economic emancipation of farm labor, these oppressed men escaped from the farms at the first opportunity to industry or the armed services.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that there is poetic justice in the dismal science of economics. If agriculture had raised its wages and labor standards along with industry, there might not have been an exodus from the fields to the factories at the first opportunity. Agriculture would have had its house in order and, if it be true, which I do not admit, that big farmers could not afford to pay higher wages out of prices received, their position would have been adjusted at the same time.

What has happened here in agriculture is, in a small way, what has happened in the international field. If we had not preferred to buy all our rubber from organizations basing their operations on the lowest sweated labor standards of the Far East, rubber sources might have been developed in South America and even within the borders of our own country. Or let us put it in another way: If the great rubber cartels had paid decent wages to their labor in the Far East, that labor would have had something to fight for at the side of the United Nations. That labor would have been more likely to stay loyal to a social, political, and economic order which had recognized them as human beings, more than work units; they would not have been so ready to steal off to the jungle to show the Japanese the shortest paths for invasion.

I say that whether commercialized agriculture wants it or not, the national interest requires that an adequate farm labor force be recruited, mobilized, and transported wherever needed by experienced agencies within the Department of Agriculture. It is important that this be done. The men who are asked to join this force will have to be assured by the Government that when they leave their places of abode to travel hundreds of miles they will be paid at least a definite minimum wage, that they will be furnished with housing for themselves and their families to the extent of a room at least 12 by 14 feet, that they will have one privy for every 25 persons, and that they will have pure drinking water. These are the standards which the supporters of this resolution wish to characterize as "social revolution under the guise of war." I want to know what are the previously existing standards obtaining in the farm labor field: Just how long are their cash wages? What kind of shelter, what kind of sanitary facilities, what kind of drinking water have these men been offered in the past if these pitifully low standards are now objected to as revolutionary?

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in winning this war. I know that we must have food, as much food as last year, more food than last year if we are to win in the shortest possible time, if we are to make good our pledges under lease-lend and to the nations we propose to liberate. Let us today vote in the best interests of the Nation and, incidentally, in the best long-run interests of agriculture, too, by voting to oppose that part of this measure which forbids the Secretary of Agriculture—

> To fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I think we ought to bear this fact in mind, that when we deal with the question of farm labor and the possibility of farm crops we are talking now about what the boys in the service are going to eat in 1944 and not in 1943. What they are going to eat in 1943 was produced on the farms last year, and unless we get busy with this farm problem now, the eating will not be good next year.

I was amazed to see this proposal attacked because it may have emanated from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Frankly, I believe when we come to this problem we ought to remember the good old proverb, "A light is good in whatever lamp it is burning." Even if those gentlemen may sit on the opposite side of the aisle, if they come forth with a good proposal, I shall be very glad to adopt it.

Actually, I think we ought to bear in mind that probably the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] did not write a line of this final bill. It is true that he and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had steadfastly advocated this principle, but so have Members on the majority side. I was one of them all the way through, as I think the gentleman from New York will concede.

Let me just say to you that when we deal with this we have to remember that the Appropriations Committee, by unanimous vote, rejected the proposal embraced in House Resolution 94, to which reference has been made. If you will look at the report on page 4, you will see that the proposal for $65,000,000 did not in any way touch the ordinary method of handling labor in this country through the United States Employment Service. It was a completely different proposal, involving only the use of the Farm Security Administration to move part of the labor crop of this United States, and I think it was upon that point that the Appropriations Committee took its action.

I wish to remind you in that connection that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] quite correctly stated that the Farm Security Administration had a right to be praised for all the splendid things it has done. Frankly I am one of those who think it has done some fine things, but it ought to be possible to state when it makes a flop that it makes a flop. The Farm Security Administration did not know anything about the importation of farm labor from another country. So it placed into that contract

a requirement that the farmer should give a performance bond to guarantee that he would fulfill all of the labor conditions, and return the laborer to Mexico. What they did not know was that the average farmer could not give that kind of bond. It was easy for the big farmer to do it. It was simple for the large cotton growers in Arizona to do it, but it was absolutely impossible for the small farmer to do it. It was absolutely impossible for the Farm Security plan to do it. The result was that no labor came into Texas, into the district represented by the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], which normally has thousands of laborers from Mexico. That district did not receive a single man. The district which I have the honor to represent, which normally imports thousands of these people, did not get a single one, simply because the Farm Security Administration did not know how they should be brought into this country.

They put in there also another provision which required $5 a head to be paid for them. We found that to be impossible. They put in there certain stipulations with reference to housing standards. Unfortunately, at the time they were trying to write those conditions into the contracts the Government was saying to you what you could not do with reference to farm construction. When the farmers tried to fill out PD Form 100 in order to get materials in order to build the kind of sheds that the Farm Security Administration said they had to have, they could not get the lumber, they could not get the materials, and they could not get the labor. When they found out their mistakes, the Farm Security Administration said to us, "Next year we will try to do better."

But I say to you there is a simple and an easier way to do better. If you will look on page 5 of the report you will see that part of this money is to be used in connection with the United States Employment Service in its Nation-wide services and then it is used by the extension services within the community or within the States. I happen to be one of those who believe firmly in the rights of the United States Employment Service to try to handle the over-all problem of labor. I ask you what is going to happen if you let the United States Employment Service try to recruit industrial labor in a community and then let the Farm Security Administration try to recruit farm labor? Let us get one over-all picture of this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for expenses necessary for the recruiting, training, and placement of workers needed for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war (including agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States); to be expended under the supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States and in Puerto Rico on the basis of existing cooperative agreements between the Department and the land-grant colleges as to the conduct of extension work and apportioned to the States on the basis of need for the purposes specified herein; for transportation and subsistence of workers and expenditures for construction, rental, or operation of temporary suitable housing or shelter facilities for such workers where existing housing facilities are not adequate (including for the purposes specified herein, agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States), to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Agricultural Extension Service in cooperation with the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States and Puerto Rico, as hereinbefore specified, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $26,100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943, of which not less than $100,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of Extension, and not less than $13,500,000 shall be apportioned to the extension service in the States on the basis of need to enable them to carry out their responsibilities hereunder within the States, including the recruiting, training, and placement of farm labor, the provision, operation, and supervision of temporary housing and shelter facilities and the transportation, supervision, temporary subsistence, and protection of workers within the States as herein provided; the remaining funds not to exceed $12,500,000 to be available as provided herein to carry out cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service for recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to State, and imported workers, including the payment of necessary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and protection of such workers while en route, and including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for the importation of workers from Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this act, but not to exceed a period of 30 days after the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That the Office of Extension Service in the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the State extension services in the States which are concerned in obtaining such labor are authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such domestic and imported labor to and from the respective States and the extension services in the States either individually or collectively may enter into such agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such labor, subject to general rules and regulations to be issued by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the United States Employment Services: *Provided further*, That the extension services of the land-grant colleges shall be responsible for the recruiting, training, transportation, and placement of all such workers within their respective States; and the Extension Service is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services and to cooperate with any other public or private agency: *Provided further*, That existing farm labor camps and other necessary housing or shelter facilities now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States Department of Agriculture and former Civilian Conservation Corps camps where suitably located shall be made available to such workers to the extent they are required and shall be operated under the supervision of the Extension Service as hereinbefore provided so long as such facilities are required for this purpose: *Provided further*, That expenditures may be made hereunder without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That any payments made by the United States or private employers to aliens brought in under this program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of section 3 (f), 7 (c), and 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'NEAL: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That for expenses necessary for the formulation, development, and execution, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and either independently or in cooperation with individuals or agencies, public or private, of a plan to assist in providing an adequate supply and distribution of labor, including sharecroppers and tenants (including aliens), for the production of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, including (1) recruiting, placement, and transportation of such labor within the continental United States and elsewhere, including transportation of their families and household effects; (2) furnishing, by loans, grants, or otherwise, of medical services, training, subsistence, and shelter; (3) construction or lease and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services; (4) employment of persons (including aliens) and organizations, by contract or otherwise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (5) purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; (6) printing and binding; (7) acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; and (8) travel expenses of persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating capacities from a foreign country to the United States and return, including such expenses to first-duty stations; there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $26,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943: *Provided*, That expenditures may be made hereunder without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That whenever labor shall be furnished hereunder to any other agency, public or private, or individual, this appropriation shall be reimbursed for expenditures on account of wages paid to such labor and other expenditures in connection therewith to the extent which the Secretary may determine to be practicable: *Provided further*, That effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3 of the act af June 29, 1936 (40 U. S. C. 433), receipts derived for the account of the United States from the use and occupancy of labor supply centers, including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That not less than $6,000,000 of the appropriation herein shall be allocated for use

by or under the direction of the Extension Service and transfers may be made, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, from $20,000,000 of this appropriation to any bureau or office of the Department of Agriculture, or to any other agency of the Government, which is assigned functions in connection herewith, in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944: *Provided further,* That any payments made by the United States or private employers to aliens under this program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code: *Provided further,* That no part of the appropriation herein made nor any of the funds heretofore appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of sections 3 (f), 7 (c), and 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. I wish information as to the procedure. This is an amendment which proposes to substitute entirely new language for the language of the pending resolution. There will perhaps be some amendments to the language of the original resolution. The inquiry I wish to make is whether or not amendments to the original resolution will be voted on before there is a vote on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that perfecting amendments will be voted on first.

Mr. TARVER. Perfecting amendments to the original resolution will be voted on first?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. That means perfecting amendments to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The CHAIRMAN. The original resolution.

The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, early in the day I addressed the Committee. The main purport of what I attempted to say was that the Manpower Commission designated by the Commander in Chief of the American Army delegated this responsibility of taking care of the farm-labor situation to the Department of Agriculture. I mentioned at that time that House Joint Resolution 94 was proposed by the subcommittee. When it came before the full committee House Joint Resolution 96, which is the Dirksen bill, was substituted and brought out. In that resolution both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture are practically eliminated from the operation of this job. It is my contention that since the job was put in their hands, since the plan proposed by the Dirksen amendment is so involved that nobody in Congress believes it will do any good—maybe a few here and there believe it will, but generally no one has expressed any confidence in its success—I believe we should revert to House Joint Resolution 94 which gives $6,000,000 to the Extension Bureau to handle the intrastate labor, which is 90 percent of the numbers involved, and then give the other $2,000,000 to the Secretary of Agriculture and allow him to handle this job as in his discretion he thinks it should be handled.

It has been said that the farm organizations are backing the Dirksen bill. Permit me to state that in the testimony before our committee Mr. Goss, apparently representing three of the large farm organizations, made this statement:

There are some phases of it which we are not sure whether they are the best people to handle, such as the contacts for Mexican labor and moving from State to State for example. There may be better agencies which are better equipped to do that in cooperation with the Extension Service.

Mr. Handschin, of the National Farm Union, said:

I understand that there has been some discussion of turning all this labor program back to the 48 State extension services. As far as the mobilization of the local labor supply is concerned, I think that is a very sensible proposal. But insofar as labor has to be mobilized and taken over State lines or even carried a long distance in a State, I think we would run into major difficulties. How can we hope to secure proper coordination and some degree of uniform enforcement between the States? There will be a natural hesitancy in any area from which farm people must be drawn into industry or in agriculture to see them go. And if you set up this program on State lines you may be well assured that will prevent us from getting our labor supply.

Another gentleman, speaking for the National Grange Council of Farm Cooperatives, the National Cooperative Milk Producers, said this:

The problem of handling the importation of foreign labor and the problem of migratory labor involve contacts with foreign governments, with different governmental departments, and with State governments. We believe these contacts should be made by the Secretary of Agriculture, his representatives, or such department or division as he may select from time to time to meet whatever situation may arise. Construction and operation of migratory labor camps are also involved. In the judgment of the Secretary and the Federal Director of Extension, the Extension Service is not equipped to handle many of the problems—

And so forth. Mr. Chairman, these farm organizations did not go that far. They even did not want to cut the sum of money that much, and I am offering this House joint resolution 94 to fix the responsibility on the Agricultural Department and rely upon them to do it. If they fail, it is their failure, not the failure of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment to the original resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 2, line 18, after the words "sum of" strike out "$26,100,000" and insert "$12,100,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted I will subsequently offer amendments to decrease the amounts named in line 21, page 2, and line 4, page 3 of the resolution, to $6,000,000 in each case. I do not desire to repeat the arguments I advanced earlier in the day. There is, as everyone must feel, a very great difference of opinion between Members of the House who are equally sincere in undertaking to deal with this problem in a practical and common-sense way, and who are equally anxious to do something to remedy the existing critical situation with respect to farm labor, if it is possible to do so. There are also wide differences of opinion between the representatives of the outstanding farm organizations in the country as to just how this problem ought to be dealt with and as to the amount of money that should be made available in an effort to deal with it.

We realize, of course, that the views of the Secretary of Agriculture are not being observed in connection with the pending resolution and however much some Members may advance the idea that the Secretary is inefficient and incapable, there are many of us who feel that he is sincere and is endeavoring as best he can to do a good job with the very difficult problems that come under his jurisdiction. In view of all this doubt, it seems to me that we should not put an unreasonable sum of money at the disposal of the authorities of the Department of Agriculture mentioned in this resolution to deal with this matter. Other authorities of the Department have had close to 7 months now to deal with it, and they have obligated only a million and a half dollars out of $5,000,000 available.

My amendment would give them $12,000,000 plus $100,000 for administrative expenses in Washington and they could continue with their existing program under the Extension Service and with the cooperation of the United States Employment Service. If they are able to make progress, if they are able to use that money and expend it wisely and aid our farmers with a program of this sort, they can come back to us next month or a month after or any time they see fit to do so and seek additional funds. If they have done a good job, if they have spent the money in a way that meets with the approval of the Congress, they will be provided with the funds in whatever amount may be needed. That does not involve any interference with the program which they have outlined. If they are able to make good on the program, all right. If they are not able to make good on it, as authorities of the Department have not been for the past several months, if they are not able to bring about any substantial accomplishment, then it certainly seems to me that $12,100,000 is enough to risk on this venture at this particular time.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I desire to say at this time.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

I am opposed to both the O'Neal and the Tarver amendments. I do not want to join in any personal criticism of the Secretary of Agriculture because I think he has been doing a good job under all the circumstances. He has many difficult and complex problems. He is an honest and patriotic public servant. I think, too, that the Farm Security Administration has accomplished much good in its peacetime program, but I cannot include the farm labor problem among its accomplishments because I think I speak with some personal knowledge. We are faced with an emergency. Social problems can wait.

I do not profess to know anything especially about the interstate or even intrastate labor problems which the Farm Security Administration has had to deal with, but, like my good friend, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], whose statements I concur in, I do have first-hand information as a result of personal knowledge and personal inspection of the situation along the Mexican border involving the Mexican labor situation.

I know that the Senators from New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas, together with the Congressmen from New Mexico, Arizona, and myself, have had repeated conferences with the Agriculture, State, and Immigration Departments, and with the Farm Security Administration in particular, in an effort to get in Mexican labor under proper conditions to harvest the essential war crops in our part of the country. I take the position in this matter that they have had no success in connection with border farm problems, whether it be the gathering of long-staple cotton or the fruit and beet crops of California, or Arizona, or Michigan, or elsewhere, or the rice crops in Judge MANSFIELD'S district, then I submit, in all fairness, it is time to try something else. The gentleman from New Mexico and I have in our districts the Rio Grande irrigation project with nearly 200,000 acres of land in the very highest state of cultivation and through the request of the War Production Board and the Department of Agriculture we planted many acres of long-staple cotton to make parachutes and other things that the War Department needed, yet many hundreds of bales of cotton in Arizona and New Mexico and west Texas were not picked.

I take the position that if you will leave the farmers alone in our part of the country to deal directly with the immigration authorities they will get the necessary farm labor to cultivate and harvest the crops, and then see to it that the Mexicans are returned to their own country.

Farming is expensive in my country. The land is valuable and water taxes very high. When the War Department asked our farmers to grow this extra long-staple cotton, they went to large expense to meet the situation. The ordinary gin would not gin this quality of cotton. They built many new gins at great expense. They did not do this voluntarily. They were not only requested, but given the assurance that labor demands would be met. The farmers' boys in my country have gone to war the same as yours. More than that, several thousand fine young Americans of Mexican descent in my city and valley have gone to the defense of our flag and country. I will never vote to take down the bars on immigration, but I am willing to trust our immigration authorities to make the restrictions as strong as they wish and let laborers come in temporarily to gather our necessary war crops. Leave it to the farmers, immigration officials, and county agents, and they will work it out. I have no doubt about it. I am opposed absolutely to unlimited and unrestricted immigration, but I have consulted with the United States immigration authorities myself, and they will agree to anything reasonable. Our farmers are honest, patriotic citizens, many of whom have sons in the service and who are eager to comply with the request of the Government in the production of long-staple cotton. They are willing to deal directly with the immigration authorities and meet any reasonable requirements and see to it that those men who come over to chop and to pick cotton or to pick fruit or harvest rice are returned to Mexico after the work is completed. They will comply absolutely with the law because they are just as anxious to win this war as the balance of us.

This resolution seems to be the only solution left because you cannot impose the restrictions of the Farm Security contracts and get results for we tried it all last year and failed. They say they will get 50,000 laborers from Mexico. They got only 5,000 all told last year, after we gave them all the money they wanted and gave them 100-percent support. And none of these were sent to my part of the country but scattered to far-distant points.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. On page 45 of the committee hearing appears a table showing the number of workers proposed to be moved into each area. I see that Texas and Oklahoma are allotted 400; 200 to Texas, and 200 to Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMASON. I venture the assertion that not 20 people came in through the El Paso immigration station to harvest crops. At least, they did not remain there and 200 workers for the big State of Texas would not be a starter. Such a proposal is ridiculous.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. I heard today from the State Department that the Mexican Government has again resumed very definite efforts to recruit labor to meet the requirements in this country.

Mr. THOMASON. The trouble is that they are recruiting them down at Mexico City and Vera Cruz, when the men are available along the border. The State Department phoned me this same message today. The trouble is they started 6 months' too late. Our crops are now being planted. The few men recruited last year were from the big cities in the southern part of the republic. They had to come several hundred miles and at great expense. They had never had any experience in farm work. Opposite my city of El Paso is the city of Juarez, where a few thousand seasonal laborers reside who know cotton farming and who want to come over and work. My farmers know many of them, and many have relatives on our side. This is war—total war. Mexico is our ally. We are all engaged in a common fight to save our liberty. We can trust our immigration officials and also our farmers, to see to it that these workers are sent back to Mexico when the job is done. The Extension Service and county agents have done a fine job for many years. Let us give them a chance. I urge support of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the deficiency subcommittee that heard the testimony on these bills, and being the author of the motion to resubmit the first resolution for consideration, I call the attention of the committee now to two or three things that I believe bear on the subject and which I should like to have you consider when you vote.

No. 1. You have just heard in the well of this House expert testimony to the effect that although the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Security Administration have been working on the problem for a year with the $5,000,000 at their disposal to use on it, they have succeeded in spending $1,500,000 and getting no labor. That justifies the committee in taking the thing out of the hands of the people who have been handling it heretofore.

No. 2. Where are you going to find this surplus of agricultural labor you are going to take from Virginia to New York or from Mississippi to Arkansas, or wherever you are going to carry them? It just is not there, unless you go into the industries of the country and take out of there the men who have gone from the farms and are working there at better wages, or unless you go into the Army and take out men who are experienced farm workers.

There is something that can be done to help this situation. I think the bill we have brought here is about all you can do, but I think you should cut the amount to $12,000,000.

I say sincerely to my friends over here that I got a little satisfaction today out of seeing the position that some of my friends are in, because it demonstrates to me that good people can go wrong sometimes. I have seen my friends over here making a gallant fight to cut down expenses of Government, to cut out waste, to save money, even a few million dollars. I have made that fight here for years, and some of us have joined together, and now we are making progress on it.

Today, when some of them go wrong it encourages me, because I go wrong

sometimes. When I see good fellows like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and my friend from New York [Mr. TABER], and my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], who are so customarily joining me down here in the well of the House to cut expenditures, fighting here today to give away $15,000,000—and it will be throwing it away—then I am encouraged because even good men go wrong. Gentlemen, do not forget that mandate from the people. Do not forget that.

Seriously, there is something that can be done and that I think will help this situation in probably a very limited way. The Extension Service has a great organization set up all over this country in every agricultural county and State in the Union. They are all ready to go. They are functioning. They have the people there. The farmers have confidence in them. In this bill we give them $6,000,000 to go into the agricultural counties within the States and do what they can to stimulate recruitment of agricultural labor. I think that will be helpful and will probably get something done.

If the Tarver amendment cutting the fund to $12,000,000 is adopted, in addition you give the United States Employment Service another $6,000,000 to let them try again to see if they can go into Mexico or the Bahamas or wherever they may go outside of the United States to bring in labor. That is a fair, conservative beginning on this thing.

As the gentleman from New Mexico has pointed out, this is not going to help the crops this year. What you do today may help the crops in 1944. But if the Extension Service and the Employment Service can take this $12,000,000, which is an ample fund for beginning, and show any signs that they are able to accomplish anything with it, this House will be ready to give them more money.

I plead with you today, you will just be throwing that other $15,000,000 down a rat hole if you appropriate it in this bill. It will not do the farmers any good and will be handing them another gold brick.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the situation in the House today is a peculiar one. The Democrats, with a majority of 13, organized the House. That means the Democrats elect the Speaker, floor leader, and other officers of the House. It also means that the Democrats retain the chairmanships of all committees and the majority on all committees; in other words, it is a Democratic House—but is it?

To date, with the exception of one important bill, lend-lease, the Republicans, in combination with a small group of southern Democrats, have dominated the situation.

Now, let us take a look at what this coalition has accomplished in the way of beneficial legislation.

First let us take a gander at the Dirksen—Republican—amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill. In cutting the appropriation for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation that organization is forced to liquidate immediately—that is, sell all its good mortgages for whatever it can get and either hold onto and carry at a great monthly loss those of its mortgages that are delinquent. This will enable the building and loan companies and associations to buy the good mortgages in at a discount and permit them to skim the cream off the whole transaction.

In the meantime, the H. O. L. C. under forced liquidation will entail a direct Treasury loss—or taxpayer loss—of approximately $400,000,000, a loss forced on the Corporation by the very interests it was created to protect. For, just remember, it was not solely for the saving of homes that this Corporation was formed, though that was its primary objective, it also saved, by bailing out, thousands of banks and building and loan associations.

This amendment was building-and-loan inspired and engineered. It may look like good business, but it is anything but good morals, or manners to deliberately rob your rescuer.

This beneficent amendment is one of the first beneficient products of this unholy alliance between Republican and anti-Roosevelt southern Democrats.

The second piece of legislation that resulted from this unholy alliance is what is known as the Disney amendment to the debt-limit bill.

In the first place that amendment had no right on that bill. It was clearly not germane, but the Rules Committee, composed almost entirely of Republicans and anti-Roosevelt Democrats, gave it a rule, waiving all points of order, thus giving it legislative status free from attack on that ground.

Now what does the Disney amendment do?

First. It repeals the President's salary limitation Executive order.

Second. It permits all salaries, regardless of how large, that were in effect before Pearl Harbor—December 7, 1941—to remain intact, subject only to the regular tax schedules.

Third. It also permits all salaries, under $67,200—salaries, mind you—to be raised to $67,200 without restraint. Wages of war workers and others—wages, mind you, as distinct from salaries—are frozen, except for the 15 percent relief afforded by the so-called Little Steel formula.

That it—the Disney amendment—is an inflationary measure there is no doubt, the reason being that there are literally millions of salaries within its fixed brackets that can be raised at will, depending on just how much of its swollen profits a corporation or partnership might desire to distribute in this way to keep its profits within a bracket that would save it hundreds of thousands in taxes and at the same time mulct the Treasury of its just dues. In the final analysis it amounts to legalized tax evasion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am not forgetting the mandate of the people, nor am I forgetting the positions that I have taken here for over 10 years on the floor of this House in the interest of economy; but there is a larger mandate here, so well expressed by Ralph Waldo Emerson when he said that nothing astonishes man so much as common sense and a little plain dealing; and, in addition, there is another mandate, the mandate of Aristotle, when he said, "Arithmetic, oh, stranger, is the greatest of sciences and the mother of invention." So, Mr. Chairman, let us apply a little plain common sense, plain dealing, and a little arithmetic to the Tarver amendment. He would reduce the amount from $26,100,000 to $12,100,000. What will happen? Six million dollars for the Extension Service. How far will it go? Let us assume that the bill becomes a law the 1st of next month. It will be for 10 months, to December 31, 1943. Scattered among the 2,920 extension agents in 2,920 counties in the United States, the result will be that $6,000,000 will be $250 per month in each of the 2,920 agricultural counties, and that will hire one good man. It will leave us nothing for subsistence, nothing for shelter, nothing for housing. His amendment would also provide $6,000,000 for United States Employment Service under the direction of the Agricultural Extension Service. How far will $6,000,000 go when it costs $100 a family to bring people in from Mexico? How far will $6,000,000 go if you are going to bring 15,000 workers in from the Bahamas? How far will it go when we undertake to transport and subsist seasonal workers to the extent of several hundred thousand from one area to another, if they are available and can be transported? How far will six million go if you are undertaking to make provision for 42,000 all-the-year-round workers? It will not do the job; and so here is arithmetic, to admonish everybody, by the opinion of Aristotle, himself, as being the mother of invention and the greatest of sciences. The very arithmetic of $12,000,000 will demonstrate that you cannot depend upon it to do the job, so I suggest that the Tarver amendment be rejected, and likewise I suggest that the O'Neal amendment be rejected, because the Secretary of Agriculture has had his chance and has failed. Here is his first press release of February 12, giving the same power to the Extension Service. Here is the second press release, dated March 1, setting up a new agricultural labor administration, and here is the third press release, dated March 5, of bringing in an agricultural work board, diffusing the responsibility, getting the thing all over the lot, and so getting all set for another failure such as we have experienced since we have been at this business from June 22, 1942, until today. Let us do the sensible thing; let us astonish ourselves and use a little common sense, as Emerson would say, and reject the O'Neal amendment and the Tarver amendment, and prosecute this thing on the basis of common sense.

[Mr. HOPE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we cannot come to some agreement as to time for debate on this matter. I ask unanimous con-

sent that all debate on the pending amendment and amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard every word that has been spoken with reference to the pending resolution. If I have ever observed a proposal that is just sort of pitifully slinking down into a corner, it is this one. It started out with a proposal for $65,000,000. Then it dropped down to a proposal for $26,000,000. Now it is proposed, "Well, let us give them $12,000,000."

The proponents of the $26,000,000 and the proponents of the $12,000,000 cannot come into the well of this House and guarantee that the expenditure of either sum is going to do anything to relieve the farm-labor situation in the United States. They are content that we have a situation, which everyone knows exists. Therefore, because we have a farm-labor situation we must do something about it. We must respond to that situation. The only way that we know how to respond is to appropriate money, and then pat ourselves on the back and say, "We have done the usual job of the New Deal. We have appropriated a lot of money and then if it does not relieve the situation we Members of Congress have done our part and we should not feel badly."

Have you not heard that argument time and time again this afternoon? I realize that there is a farm labor situation that must be dealt with. If it is bad to spend $26,000,000, it is going to be bad to spend $12,000,000. I, for one, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], am going to vote against spending a dollar of this money for a purpose which none of the members of the committee has demonstrated will accomplish the purpose that is sought to be accomplished. I am one who is going to keep the pledge I gave my people that I would not vote to spend a dollar of the taxpayers' money unless it could be shown that it was essential and necessary. That fact has not been shown by the proponents of this measure.

This problem can be dealt with. It is being dealt with in my district. It is being dealt with by volunteer help. I placed in the RECORD the results of that program some time ago. I submitted that program a year ago to Mr. McNutt and to the Department of Agriculture. It is working in my district in Wisconsin. It is contributing to relieve the farm situation and it is not costing the Federal Government a single penny. It results from a desire, a patriotic desire of the people in my district to go out and do this job. We do not have a lot of loafers lying around that the Farm Security Administration or the Extension Service or anyone else can come in and dig out by the expenditure of $26,000,000 or any other sum. There are some people who can be prevailed upon to go out on the farm and work, after they have worked 8 hours in the factory. There are some who are retired who can be recalled to the farm to do something through volunteer service. The people in the schools, the people in the plants, the people in the offices, the people in the stores are responding in my district. You have not had to spend a dime of Federal money.

Now, let us do this on the basis of patriotism and let us do it on a basis that will get some work on the farm and let us save $26,000,000 or $12,000,000. Let us save the whole business and not fritter it away as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], says you will be frittering it away if you adopt this resolution to spend $26,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tarver amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none and the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object until the gentleman tells us what he is going talk about.

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman will just wait a minute he will see.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Then I will object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The objection comes too late.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Kansas ought not to do that.

The regular order was demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MAY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. MAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. BRYSON, Mr. ELIZALDE, Mr. SIKES, Mr. CURLEY, Mr. DIMOND, and Mr. LEFEVRE asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a letter and resolution of the Badger Cooperative Creamery.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an article by George Rothwell Brown.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter on farm problems as presented by one of my constituents, and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a memorial of the Montana State Senate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein an article on taxation from the New York Times of last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein two letters and some newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article on flax entitled "An American Tragedy" written by Mr. M. W. Thatcher, the vice chairman of the National Council of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America. I am advised by the Printing Office that this will exceed the limit and that the cost will be $112.50.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr.

bers have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the March 15 issue of the Daily New Era, of Lancaster, Pa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KINZER]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

FARM LABOR PROGRAM, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 96, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 96, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, summarizing the parliamentary situation, there is pending a substitute for the resolution offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], and a perfecting amendment to the resolution itself offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. I wonder if we can arrive at some agreement as to time for debate in which we can expect to pass on the amendment?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman mean the Tarver amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All pending amendments and those read for information at the desk. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close in 150 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved, 5 minutes for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and 5 minutes for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 150 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and one-half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that is 15 minutes more than the total of all applications that have been made up to this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what would happen to amendments to the original resolution—other amendments than the Tarver amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They may be offered at the close of the time fixed for debate.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would that include any other amendments that might be offered to this bill? I have one or two amendments I propose to offer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. How much additional time would the gentleman require?

Mr. FULMER. I would like to have at least 10 minutes on my amendments.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Chairman, in order to comply with the request of the gentleman from South Carolina, I ask that the time for debate be increased to 160 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 160 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman, assuming the time to be equally divided among those who are standing, how much time will each Member have?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The 160 minutes is 15 minutes more than a total of 5 minutes for each Member.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tarver amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there was considerable discussion on the floor yesterday to the effect that while all of us recognized and do recognize the serious and acute situation with reference to the shortage of farm labor, no one has done much of anything about it except talk. Largely that may be true, but I may say for the benefit of some of those that have been so vociferous in their remarks on that subject that this matter has had the very careful and considerate attention and a lot of work by your Committee on Agriculture.

Our chairman, realizing the serious situation and growing exodus from the farms of farm labor as well as farm operators, more than a year ago called Secretary Wickard, General Hershey, and others having to do with the manpower of this country, before our committee, and we spent days and weeks trying at that time to convince those in authority that the situation was progressively becoming more serious and that we were very likely to face, and face soon, the problem now confronting us. I may say with some modesty that last October, and even before that time, I personally called the attention of this House to this matter and set out in a letter to General Hershey a resolution which I believed would be beneficial in the way of stopping the exodus of manpower from the farms. If you will look at the RECORD of October 12, 1942, you will find the eight-point program I submitted at that time containing many of the suggestions that are contained in the Bankhead bill pending in the Senate.

I shall support the Tarver amendment, because I am convinced that $12,100,000, the amount suggested by the gentleman from Georgia, will do the work just as effectively as the amount provided for in the bill. You are not going to get much help, scarcely any help at all for States, such as my State, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Indiana, and most of the other farm States, except such as you have in those States right now. The only thing you can do, so far as seasonal crops is concerned, will be to shift some labor from one part of a State to another. You are not going to be able to take that labor within those States to other sections of the country to any great extent. The labor that would be of any value is just not there, and there is no sense in using money to buggyride a few back and forth over the country.

California and some of the other border States face a more serious situation. The testimony before our committee recently was that about six millions would be largely sufficient to take care of the matter of getting Mexican labor into those sections of the country. That will leave $6,000,000 plus for these other States I have mentioned and other sections of the country for recruiting and transporting seasonal labor. I have a high regard for the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and others on the Appropriations Committee. However, I say to you in all seriousness that you are not going to get much at best, because the exodus from the farms into the defense plants and into the Army has already taken practically all of the available labor.

I am in accord with the suggestion of the committee that this be handled by the Extension Service, because, as the gentleman from Arizona and others have said, it has been demonstrated that the Farm Security Administration have already displayed their inability to do this work.

I say to this House that I think as do other members of my committee who have given much time to the investigation of this problem, that $12,000,000 will do the job just as well as $26,000,000.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand the gentleman to say that $6,000,000 will take care of any importation of foreign labor that we might need? Was that the testimony from all the States on the border? I am very doubtful that $6,000,000 will do this part.

Mr. RIZLEY. I feel sure that it would quite adequately take care of it. That was the conclusion I reached from the testimony before our committee.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The gentleman is a member of the committee on which I,

too, have the honor to serve. This committee has considered this matter but they have never been able to jar loose anything, have they?

Mr. RIZLEY. I will say to my friend from Iowa that I regret to say, we did not seem to be able to get those in high places very much concerned, until almost too late.

Mr. GILCHRIST. They have obtained promises, but they have not been fulfilled.

Mr. RIZLEY. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa.

General Hershey said, and Mr. McNutt said, and everyone else who came before our committee who had any connection with the manpower situation said they were going to do something about it, but that was about as far as it went; nothing was done; only now they are beginning to awaken to the extreme seriousness of the situation that some of us were greatly concerned about a year ago when we first started these hearings.

Mr. Chairman, we have a very definite committment to the people of this country to cut and cut to the quick every appropriation where possible to do so. I think we can save $12,000,000 by the adoption of the Tarver amendment without injury to the purposes of the bill. I sincerely hope a majority of the Committee will vote accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The CHAIR recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] for 5 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent before I take my 5 minutes that my amendment may be read for the information of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to be offered by Mr. PACE: Page 4, line 7, after the colon following the word "service", insert *"Provided further,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, or for the transportation of any worker outside the limits of the State where he resides or is working without the prior consent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture for such State, or other official who performs similar functions for such State."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, a close reading of page 4 of this bill will show you that two entirely separate and distinct systems of recruiting and transporting are set up. Lines 8 to 13 on page 4 provide for recruiting and transporting within the State, and that is to be done by the State extension service. Lines 2 to 7, inclusive, set up a system for recruiting and transporting beyond the State, and that is to be done by the United States Employment Service under a general agreement with the Extension Service.

It would be most unfortunate if we permitted a system to be set up here, which would be accepted as instructions from the Congress, to permit the United States Employment Service to go into a county or a State where there is now a critical shortage of labor to recruit and transport those workers to other sections.

If you will refer to page 8 of the committee report you will find this language:

Before any transportation out of a county or State is effected clearance should be had with the appropriate county and State authorities so that local and State needs will not be jeopardized by an exodus which cannot be returned in time to meet the local or State crop requirements.

The amendment I propose is simply writing into the resolution and making a matter of law exactly what the committee has suggested should be the operation under the bill. I am advised that the amendment is entirely acceptable to the committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia as revised and as just read to the House is in complete accord with the purpose and object of the bill. The committee is glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I have here a letter from a large milk producer in my State who markets in the Cleveland milkshed. I shall not mention his name, but I shall read his letter:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *March 15, 1943.*

DEAR CLIFF: The enclosed came to my desk this morning. It made me so damn mad I crushed it, then I thought I would send it on to you.

Notice affidavit farmer must sign to hire 1 of them 40 hours per week. My boys put in 70, and if they didn't I would close out, and I am shipping 3,000 pounds of milk daily. Will the fools in Washington ever learn any sense? Milk would need to retail for 30 cents per quart instead of 15 cents if my men went on a 40-hour basis.

I shall not read the postscript, as there is some language in it that I think had better be expurgated.

The affidavit to which he refers reads as follows:

This is to certify that I, _____, a farmer and resident of _____ County, _____, do own and operate a farm in the said county of _____, and that I am unable to work my farm in the proper manner because of the shortage of labor in this section.

I further certify that if Sergeant _____ is released from the Army of the United States to work with me on my farm, I will employ him steadily at the rate of $20 per week for 40 hours per week plus room and board.

This affidavit is to be signed by the farmer, and it is to be sworn and subscribed to before a notary public.

This is the letter that caused this situation to arise:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *March 9, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: My son, Sergeant _____, is interested in farm work. Has been in the Army 2 years February 20. He is stationed in Fort _____. If you are in need of help, he will be very glad to serve his country on the farm. I am his mother and would appreciate your consideration.

If milk and food must be produced on a 40-hour week, it may be that the farmers may have to join and unionize. Thirty-cent milk will not look so good to some of you.

I called the Adjutant General's office about this letter a while ago and asked about their regulations. The first time I called the man I talked to, he said this was not required, as far as the Army was concerned, and suggested that the county agent and probably two disinterested people sign this request for the boy to return. A little later he called my office and said that that was not particularly necessary, that the request was going to be returned to the local draft board for their action.

If you were serving on a local draft board, would you bring Sam Jones' boy home and leave Tom Brown's boy in the service? You are not going to get any men that way. These draft boards are only human, and they are the neighbors of the men who were sent.

Every day this food crisis gets worse. We have had many hearings about it, hearing Mr. Wickard one day, Mr. McNutt the next day, Mr. Hershey the next day, and Governor Townsend the next day. The ball went around the infield like the old Tinker-to-Evers-to-Chance combination, three up, three down, no hits, no runs, but a lot of errors, and no men for the Army.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. What department of Government attempted to impose a 40-hour week on this farm?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I cannot tell the gentleman that. This is the copy of the affidavit the farmer was given to fill out to ask for the discharge of this soldier to serve on his farm.

Mr. CURTIS. Who furnished the affidavit, the War Department?

Mr. CLEVENGER. The letter does not say.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN] for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] is recognized.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, if it were not for the fact that there will be a scarcity of food for the American people during the next 12 months I would not favor this measure. But we all know that it takes man and machine power to produce food, and we do not have either the men or the machine power to provide all of the food that is required by the Government for our armed forces, the Allies, and for civilian needs.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] referred to this measure as a relief measure for the farmers. That may be his idea of relief. If it is any kind of a relief measure, it is a relief measure for the American people so that they can get food. Personally, I feel that most of

the damage has been done as far as farm labor is concerned. During the past 18 months approximately 3,600,000 workers have gone from the farms into the armed services and into the war industries. That is a lot of labor from the farms of America.

In the Middle West most of the damage has been done, because we operate in the dairy section where you need labor all the year round to take care of the dairy herds. We are asked to produce an increased amount of dairy products. Instead of securing that increase, it now looks as though we will have 20 or 30 percent less dairy products for the coming 12 months, which means strict rationing of butter, and possibly milk, throughout the country.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. As I understand, the gentleman represents a district where they raise corn. Today the ceiling on corn is so low that you cannot sell your corn for a price which it will cost you to raise it next year on account of the increase in farm labor. If they would spend this sum of money and raise the ceiling on corn we would get our labor, but today with the ceiling so low, we cannot look forward to raising next year's crop because we cannot pay the increased wages.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There may be something to what the lady says, but in our section Mr. Wickard would not let the farmers plant enough corn to feed their own livestock.

Now, a lot of blame has been put on Secretary Wickard for not taking care of this problem. I would like to clear that up. While he is partly responsible, there are others who are equally responsible. Mr. Wickard came before our committee a year ago in February. We also had Mr. McNutt, Mr. Hershey, and men from other agencies outside of the Department of Agriculture, where they have to do with manpower. We stressed to these officials the need for planning, in order to secure an adequate amount of farm labor for 1943, but we were told by Mr. Wickard and by Mr. McNutt and others that there would be an abundance of food, that we would have plenty of manpower, and they would not worry at all about it. In fact, I went so far as to ask Mr. Wickard to present this problem at a Cabinet meeting and he said it was not necessary to do that because he would take care of the situation. While they did not recognize this manpower shortage problem until along in October or November last year, we had predicted 8 or 9 months earlier that it was coming. Now we are facing a real serious situation when it comes to the production of food. We must have food for our armed forces and for the civilian needs of this country.

I heard Secretary Stimson speak the other evening in regard to the size of the Army. He mentioned nothing about food and securing food for the Army or for the civilian population. I can see why he took the attitude that he did, because he knows the armed forces are going to get whatever food there is in the country, irrespective of the demands of the civilian population. Therefore, we in Congress must look after the food supply and the manpower to produce. I hope that this bill will aid in providing the manpower that is needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to confirm the statements made by my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], on yesterday, who pointed out the specific requirements and the peculiar situation of those border States in the Southwest in regard to agricultural labor and our farm problems.

I am inclined to oppose the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]. Something has been said about this bill's kicking the Department of Agriculture out of the picture. I cannot see it that way. It is true, this measure seeks to take this manpower problem away from the Farm Security Administration and put it in other agencies of Government, but I call attention to the fact that those other agencies of the Government are part of the Department of Agriculture.

Not only that, but they are older and more experienced and long-established agencies having to do with local control and having better acquaintance with local conditions. For that reason and because, although a good friend of the Farm Security Administration and willing to go to bat for them for the work for which their organization was recently established, I do believe, as I said earlier, that F. S. A. has fallen down on the job in my part of the country, and I am constrained to favor a change.

We have heard much said about trying to distribute something that does not exist—manpower. It may be there is a general shortage all over the country. It may be we will have some difficulty in getting farm laborers to go from one State to another. But down on the border in my State we have specialized crops that require seasonal work, and heretofore it has been supplied even in peacetime to a limited extent from our neighboring republic to the south. We are dependent during wartime for more of that labor, and if we cannot get it under proper conditions we simply cannot grow one of the very much needed agricultural products.

I refer particularly to long fiber cotton. Although I have no personal investments in American-Egyptian cotton, even in peace time I have done what I could to encourage its production, extend its markets and protect it from its greatest competitor from the Valley of the Nile. With the coming of war and the loss of our supply of silk, I urged consideration of this remarkable fiber in lieu of silk. It is today needed and wanted by the War Department. With Mexico in this war as our ally, surely mutually satisfactory arrangements can be worked out so that a supply of this labor can be had.

In such international matters, even between friends and allies, it takes two to make a bargain. The Mexican government must be satisfied with any arrangement and our people, as a whole, must be satisfied. Now, the Mexican government rightfully insists on certain requirements for her citizens to come in here and I think we ought to be in position to meet those requirements, but to do it in a way that is satisfactory to the Republic of Mexico and not offensive or impossible of attainment to American citizens who want to hire them.

I take it for granted that the new agency in which we would place this power can do that as satisfactorily as any other agency of the Government. It will have to be a matter of negotiation with the Republic of Mexico. I want those imported laborers to be protected and their Government is going to see to that. I also want our country to be protected at the same time and that, I think, any sensible agency of the Government will also attend to.

But I do want to emphasize the need of getting this labor, because if we do not get it we cannot grow this long-fiber cotton. I am not in favor of a penny-pinching policy in regard to funds and what the Government must do in order to get this labor. It is going to take money to do this and do it right. For that reason I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. BELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. BELL. The gentleman just mentioned some requirements the Mexican Government is making. I wonder if the gentleman would enlighten us as to what they are asking to be done before we import these people.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Mexican Government requires certain minimum housing conditions and certain guaranties concerning pay.

Mr. BELL. What are the conditions concerning pay?

Mr. MURDOCK. I will not have time to be specific, but the whole controversy down in the Southwest has grown out of that very thing. It has been a technical matter of terms of contract and yet farmers have been paying more than the minimum. I believe that another agency of the Government is in better position to work this out on a satisfactory basis with the Mexican Government.

[Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending at the desk, and I ask that it be read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be reported for the information of the House.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 5, line 7, after "impose", insert "unreasonable."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have time to discuss many things about this bill which I am afraid I will not have time to do. But, first, it is incument upon me to explain my amendment. One of the things which we on the west coast hope this bill will accomplish is the facilitation of the movement into our section of several thousand workers from our neighboring Republic of Mexico. We realize that our problem in this regard is different from the problems of many other parts of the country.

I recognize the fact that there are two distinct problems involved in this farm-labor situation. One is the problem of the steady, skilled "hired man" who works through the year on the farm and who needs to be a skilled man. I am not going to discuss that, nor do I think this bill is the answer to it. Real deferment from the draft is one answer. And there are one or two others that could be applied. But I cannot discuss them now.

The second problem is the problem of seasonal labor that is necessary in large numbers and of which in California we need at the peak about 250,000 at least over normal agricultural employment. In this connection, I frankly think we are going to have to rely on local people to meet most of this problem in most areas. So far as making arrangements for such help by local people, for the employment of high-school students and others, this should be in the hands of an agency that is rooted as firmly in the local community as possible The extension service is such an agency.

Personally, I have advocated before, and I say again, that I wish all the contacts of the farmer with the Federal Government could be concentrated in one agency, his applications for gasoline, the securing of labor, his protest against price ceilings, his applications for machinery and everything else, and that this might be concentrated in the county war boards. This would do more to simplify the farmers present problems than anything else I know.

This bill says that the Extension Service is going to do the local recruitment part of this job and that it is to be responsible in cooperation with the Employment Service for the movement of workers from foreign countries or from one part of our country to another. So far as I am concerned, the main thing is to get definite responsibility fixed in the hands of some one agency. So far as western agriculture is concerned, as the gentleman from Arizona has already said, if we are to do the job in California that needs to be done, it is necessary that some arrangement be made with Mexico so that several thousand of their people can help at doing that job.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment inserts the word "unreasonable" just before the words "minimum wages" or "housing standards", and the reason I offer it is because I do not see how we can make an agreement to bring workers in unless some kind of assurances as to reasonable standards of wage payment and where people are going to stay when they come to work can be given. I do not of course want workers brought in to our country temporarily to enjoy a favored position relative to workers of our own country. I do not think that should happen.

My own position is that agriculture, both the farmer and the farm worker have been depressed through the years and that neither the farmer nor his workers have received the income they should have. I join with other Members of the House in protesting a great many of the price ceilings for this reason. I support the idea that farm labor costs should be included in computing parity prices. But I hope we are not going to hamstring the administration of this measure by making it impossible for reasonable agreements and reasonable assurances to be given to people when they are recruited to go and do the work that we need to have done, because if the bill is finally enacted in its present form it may seriously affect the chance of securing the labor that we in the West are going to have to have. No one dislikes, on principle, more than I do, the importation of workers from foreign nations, but for this war period our California agriculture is absolutely dependent upon this being done.

Mr. Chairman, there is also another idea in my mind. It was expressed yesterday by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] when he pointed out that after all a large part of our reliance in meeting a great share of this problem of our farm work during this war is going to be upon the patriotism of our own people who will come out to help to get the job done. They have already done so in many cases—schools have been closed for certain periods in some of the States, farm and city people have turned out, farm people themselves have redoubled their efforts—but, with all of this, still the great seasonal labor problem of California and some other Western States cannot be met unless the Mexican workers come.

Now, I think it is necessary that some agency should have definite and exclusive responsibility for making arrangements for marshaling all the available local labor in each county and locality. This bill gives that responsibility to the Extension Service. I do not think that the Extension Service can do the job of bringing people from the neighboring Republic of Mexico or do the job of recruiting people in one part of our country for work elsewhere. I think that is going to have to be done by some national agency. Some time ago I recommended as earnestly as I knew how that a special section of the United States Employment Service should be set up exclusively devoted to agriculture because I think that would have helped and will still help. This bill gives the Employment Service this latter responsibility.

I shall support this bill. But I want to say a word about the Farm Security Administration. I do not share most of the criticism of that agency that has been made by many people. I think there have been obstacles in the way of getting some of these things done which have not been the fault of Farm Security. I am not saying they have not made mistakes. But I am most earnestly in support of any program which attempts to help the small farmers and the migratory farm workers in this country, and I believe that agency has done great good in helping thousands of those families to raise their standards of living and to achieve a better level of production than they had before.

I earnestly appeal to the House to support my amendment. I will not have another opportunity to speak for my amendment. It expresses the purpose of the House that no unreasonable standard should be set, but it at least makes it possible for a Government agency which is going to recruit labor to give some assurance to those workers as to what they will receive for their work. I believe this is the simple duty of a governmental agency engaged in work of this kind. And I am convinced such reasonable assurances will be absolutely necessary if we are to obtain from our neighbor, Mexico, the workers which are absolutely necessary to our western agriculture. Furthermore, wages in excess of any reasonable minimum are already being paid by the farmer employers.

Farm income needs raising all along the line. And I remind the House of the point repeatedly made to the effect that one reason for the shortage of farm labor is the disparity between industrial and agricultural wages.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Does the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] desire recognition at this time?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 4 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels constrained to point out that time has been limited.

The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to speak for 4 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the rule prevent a request for additional time when debate has been limited?

The CHAIRMAN. It can be extended by unanimous consent.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I make the point of order that the time cannot be extended

when it has been fixed, not even by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Any Member can object to the gentleman's request.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I can have no faith in legislation of the sort we are now discussing. I was brought up on a farm and own and operate some farm land now. I think I understand the difficulties and troubles that would beset a program such as is here proposed. I am fearful this scheme would be more likely to still further frustrate agriculture and reduce production rather than increase it.

Hand $26,000,000 out to a group of people who have never had the responsibility of administering any substantial sums of money to operate a program of this kind and it is a foregone conclusion that the waste would be colossal, the good done small, and the damage great.

It appears to me Congress is here applying just a bit more salve to soothe the public mind. Until the political shackles are removed from the farmers and they are relieved of all bureaucratic meddling, and further, until they are able to secure freely all the farm machinery and supplies for their unhampered needs, the food shortage will increase no matter what else may be done. I think insofar as the farm-labor shortage can be relieved this can and will best be done if left entirely to local communities.

With respect to some of its operations, the Congress appears to have become a spectacle.

From the right side of the aisle and the left side of the aisle, largely irrespective of party affiliation, almost daily, curses rain down upon the bureaucracy. It is damned for just about every wrong that besets our social and economic body—for its stupidity, arrogance, extravagance and corruption; for food shortages and the attendant evils of rationing and price fixing and what not.

Yet the one and only cure which it seems the Congress possesses for each and every economic and social maladjustment or disease it diagnoses is more bureaucracy.

A food shortage impends. Among other serious factors a shortage of farm labor is manifest. The Congress can relieve this of course, for, judging from the great mass of laws it grinds out daily, it must believe itself capable of healing about all the ills, social, economic, as well as bodily, to which man and beast are heir.

So laboring under what M. Guizot called "a gross delusion, a belief in the sovereign power of political machinery," which, aside from its motivating forces, is the very alpha and omega of the New Deal, the Congress proposes to appropriate millions and create more political machinery to cure said farm labor shortage.

If the remedy works, well and good. The Congress then stands ready and willing to take full credit for the cure. If it fails and musses things up more, well and good, also, for could not Congress show that it had tried and is perfectly willing to try again by appropriating more funds and setting up more political machinery to do the job?

One is reminded in this connection of some of the earlier ideas of medicine. Hahnemann, founder of homeopathy, for example, propounded the peculiar doctrine that all chronic diseases were the result of the itch, syphilis, or sycosis, or they were caused by medicines. He blamed the medicines given by doctors for being the cause of many diseases.

Well, speaking of one of the segments of the economy, the one we are at present concerned with—agriculture—we are pretty sure its troubles cannot be blamed on the itch or syphilis, but Congress surely has been giving the farmers a lot of medicines.

And, strangely, the very theory of therapeutics that guided old Dr. Hahnemann in his practice appears to be the one that gives direction to Congress in healing the ills of our social and economic body. Similia similibus curantur, like cures like, said Dr. Hahnemann. So when he had a patient suffering from what he believed to be the taking of some medicine, why, he would prescribe more medicine of the very same kind that made him sick to make him well again.

So with the Congress, bureaucracy has the country in the dog house, and to get it out of the dog house the Congress must prescribe more bureaucracy for the country.

This bill proposes to import 50,000, and we don't know how many more, Mexican farmers to take the place of our boys who left their farms in this country to go to war.

Mexico has declared war, on paper, on the Axis powers. She is supposed to be an ally of ours. We are giving her war supplies under lend-lease which she is using to build up her home defenses. She has no soldiers fighting in the war, and there is no indication she intends that they have any soldiers fighting on foreign soil.

This is a good example of lend-lease in reverse, of which we have been hearing so much lately. We take the young men of our own country from our farms and send them across the far seas to the four corners of the earth to keep the enemy away, not only from our own shores, but the shores of Mexico as well. Under lend-lease we give our war supplies away to Mexico—Mexico does not send any soldiers to fight, but sends us her farmers, whom we have to pay well, to take the place of our farmers who had to go to war.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make some observations. I am not going to attempt an argument because, being a lawyer, I could not make one in 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I was impressed with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I feel that he has given us the best analysis of this bill that we have so far heard, though I do not entirely agree with him.

My good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Utah, said a few moments ago to me: "The country is asking for bread, but in passing this bill we are handing it a stone." That is what it amounts to. The Congress cannot do everything, notwithstanding a lot of people think so. I have heard here on the floor of this House the Agriculture Department kicked all over the lot for shortage of manpower. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that such kicking is another instance of play on prejudice that is gradually being developed against the administration in this House. I do not deny that politics are at the bottom of this.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard in the last few weeks speeches made on the floor of the House and one made here yesterday morning that under all of the circumstances I was sorry and regretted that they were made. We must not forget that we are in a terrible war. Our boys are being killed from the North Atlantic, where they were frozen to death with oars of boats in their frozen hands, trying to save their lives after escaping from a torpedoed ship, to the farthermost point in the South Pacific and to the hot sands of Africa. These speeches serve no good purpose. It is my belief that if the Members of Congress quit fighting the Roosevelt family and direct their heavy guns toward our enemies, Hitler and the Japs, we might win this war much sooner than we are going to if we constantly snipe and jibe at our Commander in Chief and his family. These speeches are not confined to either side of the aisle. It is not vital to the perpetuity of this Government whether or not a Democrat or Republican Party survive as such, but it is vital to our country, yours and mine, should we lose this war.

I now want to call attention to the fact that we have a scarcity of farm labor. We have this scarcity for two reasons, and the two reasons are these: The inordinately high wages paid by war industry have taken boys off the farms, and the administration of the Draft Act, if you please, by the local boards, is the other reason. The local boards had discretion to defer farm boys, but in many instances they did not exercise it. The Agriculture Department is not to blame for that; but it is to blame for one thing, and its action is indefensible, in this respect, and that is this, failing to demand from the War Production Board sufficient steel with which to make adequate farm machinery to run the farms of this country for the year 1943.

First, I am informed that an order was made providing for production of new farm machinery amounting to 23 percent of the production of such machinery in the year 1940. Subsequently and a long time thereafter an order was made, yet not carried out, that the production should equal 40 percent of 1940. Per-

sonally, I happen to know that even last year we were unable to secure necessary farm machinery and repairs. If that were the situation last year what can we hope for this year with production decreased as indicated by the above percentages. If the War Production Board refused to comply with the reasonable demand made by the Agriculture Department, the Agriculture Department failed when it did not let the country know the true situation and where was the bottleneck. That is where it fell down.

I have been told on reasonably fair authority that only six-tenths of 1 percent of the steel of this country has been allocated to the production of new farm implements for the year 1943.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. It would take less than 1 percent of the steel produced today to furnish the farmer with all the machinery parts, and repairs required to produce all the food we and our allies need.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is exactly right. There is where the Department of Agriculture fell down. It did not stand on its hind legs and fight for adequate machinery from the War Production Board. That is one of the causes of the lack of food production.

If we pass this bill, if we give them all they ask, I doubt that we will increase the production of food. I do not believe you can transport men from California or Michigan to my State of Montana and get any results.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is contending that the appropriation of money will not produce food, that you still have to put the seed in the ground.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is only being practical. You must have men to work, and the appropriation of money will not furnish those men, though we can try.

(Mr. O'CONNOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the administration and the Congress seem to be suffering from an overdose of delusions, illusions, and hallucinations. Both seem to feel that the appropriation of money will produce the food. I do not believe it. Money will purchase food, it will not produce food.

The gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], who just left the floor, suggested that instead of making changes we devote our energies to the carrying on of this war, and part of that, the war program, naturally and inevitably must be the production of food. I go along with him on that, but I propose to fight anyone and everyone who gets in the way of the farmer who is trying to produce food for the fighting men and the home folks. This administration has been doing that right along.

I will give you a concrete illustration of just what I mean. In my own home county at a little crossroads is a farmers' co-op. They do business with farmers who live within a radius of about 6 miles and no more. During the past year the farmers in that community produced and this co-op shipped over 2,000,000 dozen eggs. They did a business of more than $2,000,000. And the business made a profit. They produced, processed, sold, and delivered farm produce, that is food. What happened to them? Let me read you this letter I just received:

HAMILTON FARM BUREAU,
Hamilton, Mich., March 11, 1943.

Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLARE: Last week, while in Washington, I told you about some of the problems which we were having. I found out, on my return home, that it has gotten more serious. We had filed an application for an increase in wages for most of our employees which took two of our employees about a day to get the information and fill out. Last week the application was returned, stating that it was not properly filled out and it probably will take two people another day to get the information they want.

In the meantime, our employees are leaving. Last week we lost three more in our egg department. They can leave here and go to Holland and work in a defense plant with much higher wages. We have closed up our egg-breaking department. Today we started handling part of our eggs on a current receipt basis as we do not have enough help to have them candled and graded. I am sure that our poultry-dressing department will operate at less than one-half of our capacity. We are having trouble in both of our feed plants, which is most serious. We are unable to take care of our feed customers and will have to turn down handling a large volume of poultry and eggs from our producers unless we get relief at once.

I do not believe that it is the intention of anyone that egg and poultry plants, such as we operate, should have to be closed down. Regulations which we have to comply with are too complicated and, in many cases, cannot even be interpreted by attorneys.

I am predicting that, unless we get relief, we will have to close up our poultry and egg departments before this summer is over.

I have warned State selective service headquarters in Michigan as far back as July 1941, that unless they changed their attitude toward agricultural workers being essential, that this country would face a food shortage. I am now predicting that the bottleneck which is developing in our food-processing plants in this country will be more critical than what food production has become.

We request that the regulations covering the freezing of wages be amended to exempt agricultural processing plant workers who operate in rural areas and on a substandard wage.

We all know that on account of war, that we will have to operate under some additional regulations, but we do hope and pray that Congress will see to it that these regulations be simplified so the average person can understand them and get the information that is required. These complicated regulations have caused a great deal of confusion and I know that many persons have violated a great many of these regulations. Last night our board of directors discussed whether it would be more practical to comply with many of the regulations we now have to operate under and which are curtailing our operations, or to disregard them and make every effort to expand our food program which will help feed our people and shorten the war. Many firms have already violated many of these regulations and are facing being given a fine or a jail sentence.

Our problem is today, that we have too many regulations. Before long we will have more people trying to regulate than we will have in production and processing. This situation has become so acute that it is delaying our winning the war.

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FARM BUREAU,
A. G. LOHMAN, *Manager.*

They have trouble keeping their employees. They have the men and the women in that community able and willing to grow the food and produce the poultry. These are second and third generation Hollanders, whose folks came originally from the Netherlands. They are honest, patriotic, industrious, thrifty, God-fearing people. They have the men and women, boys and girls to grow the things they want to process and ship. The employees are there. They have the money to pay them in competition with the wages paid in the nearby cities, where there are factories paying high wages in war production. They can produce. They have the equipment to process this food. But to keep their employees they want to pay wages to meet competition. What happens to them?

They make their application for permission to increase wages, not to cut them down, and the administration down here through one of the bureaus tells them that the application is not right. They have been trying for 2 weeks or more to get this permit. They are not dumb. They are not ignorant. They are successful business people and farmers.

To show you just how patriotic these Hollanders are, notice particularly this part of the letter:

Last night our board of directors discussed whether it would be more practical to comply with many of the regulations we now have to operate under and which are curtailing our operations, or to disregard them and make every effort to expand our food program which will help feed our people and shorten the war. Many firms have already violated many of these regulations and are facing being given a fine or a jail sentence.

The people who are producing and processing these foods, because of their patriotism, because of their realization that the boys—and many of their boys have gone and some have died—in the fighting forces must have this food, are now discussing the policy of going ahead and facing a fine or jail sentence or else complying with the regulations which hinder their efforts. They may be forced to violate the law in order to do their part toward feeding their own sons who are on the battle front.

I ask you, when the farmer is ready to go ahead, is there any reason why these fellows down below should not get off his neck and let him go? Must a man

take the chance of paying a fine or going to jail in order to exercise the right of supplying those who need the food with that food? That is the situation. Instead of paying $26,000,000 let the administration get off the farmer's back and let him go, especially when he is ready and has the ability.

Our ancestors, to make a profit, stole the Negroes from their homes, sold them to the southerners who wanted cheap labor, and we now have the so-called race problem. The last and the present generation wanted and they got the Japs on the west coast to do manual work, the stoop work so-called, and we now have the Japs on our hands.

Under this bill, as it reads at the moment, aliens can be brought in to aid, it is said, the farmer, and when the immediate need is over what will we do with them.

Let every other farm boy, every other hired man stay at home; give the farmers adequate farm machinery, free them from the shackles the administration has fastened upon them and they will produce.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may withdraw his motion.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] for 5 minutes.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, when a patient is really ill they call for the experts. Sometimes they send for the experts and find that it was the coroner that they needed. At this late hour I do not know whether or not the experts can do much good, or whether the coroner can only view the remains, but I do well remember the old saying that perhaps the most impudent words are "I told you so." About 1 year ago, some may remember, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, said that before the end of 1943 we were going to have a strenuous food shortage and that no bureaucrat in Washington will do anything about it until it hits him square across the face. He was quoted all over the country. I said to you at that time, as some of you will remember in my short statement of 5 minutes, that before the end of 1943 there would be a wailing cry of "When do we eat?" Some folks may remember that. Since then much water has gone over the dam, but the sad part of it is that while we view the remains, with the coroner, the end is not yet. The desecration of the body still goes on. With an army of 11,000,000 plus in sight, so they say, there is more draining of farm labor still going on and yet to go on. We are told that the farm-labor shortage at this hour is the greatest shortage since 1922. What will it be by July; what will it be by next January? Oh, yes; some of our Members on both sides of the aisle who represent city districts treated the matter very lightly when the farm boys had the question up a year ago and we were talking about a 110-percent parity. We were outvoted.

Some of them, however, are consistent; they were opposed to doing anything then and are opposed now. However, some of the others have reversed themselves, and have seen their mistake. I remember one Member said here, we may well hear from the consumer, and that we would hear from them last November, if farm prices were raised. However, we are hearing now, but their inquiry is "What can I get"? This bill may not do much good in some areas; but it may do much good some places, and whatever good it does, it is that much.

The Secretary of Agriculture has a veto power under the law on the O. P. A. farm prices when he chooses to use it. They are holding a meeting down town today, discussing the price of hogs. Let us hope that the price fixed will take into full consideration all the rise in prices of other things and hogs be kept at a price that will pay returns under all our present circumstances.

The standards made by the Selective Service Board for exemption of farm labor were too high. The War Production Board did not allot enough steel to make farm implements and repairs.

Real, experienced farm workers are as much war workers as millions of others and food production must have equal attention with other war production. I am supporting the resolution of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I thought I would take a few minutes to shed tears over the same body the preceding speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] referred to. I understand that my good friend from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] held the wake this morning, but I am hopeful that perhaps we can provide a little artificial respiration with the pending measure. I cannot agree with my good friend, the genial gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], who spoke yesterday, that the passage of this bill is going to do any harm to the Department of Agriculture. Certainly some blame must be placed somewhere for the failure of our present program, as far as farm manpower is concerned. If the blame has to be placed in the lap of the Secretary of Agriculture, let us put it there. If it is to be shared by the Farm Security Administration, then that agency has to accept its share of the blame. I would like to have you refer to the hearings on page 102, to a statement by Mr. Ogg, of the National Farm Bureau Federation. He had this to say:

> Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee: Speaking for the American Farm Bureau Federation, we feel that the present program of recruiting and placing farm labor is being very badly bungled, that it is not adequate to do the job, and that the best evidence of that is what has happened up to date. We have already lost very considerable quantities of food and fiber because of the bungling of the farm labor recruitment program.

I heartily subscribe to that statement. If we have to take this thing out of the hands of the Farm Security Administration, or even the Department of Agriculture, let us do it. It may not be too late. I think we can still render some valuable assistance in insuring a supply of farm labor for harvesting food crops during the 1943 season. At least we can try.

On page 119 of the hearings appears a statement by a gentleman representing the farmers in Florida, with reference to the activities of the Farm Security Administration:

> I condemn them to the fullest extent as being impractical, cumbersome, and dripping with red tape and reform. Apparently social reform is all the Farm Security Administration people have in mind. While our crops wilt and rot they dilly-dally dawdle around with all their foolishness.

There is another statement I subscribe to 100 percent. We have had some experience in California with the Farm Security Administration attempting to import Mexican labor to help harvest our crops. It looks to me as though the Farm Security Administration is more interested in teaching Mexican laborers to eat steak and pie instead of tortillas and frijoles than in harvesting our crops. Enough of social reforms and confusion—let us have some action.

Yesterday the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] referred to the cost of this program. May I point out that last year, due to the shortage of agricultural labor in the State of California alone, crops were lost to the extent of nearly $10,000,000. According to the hearings, in Arizona last year cotton and alfalfa amounting to approximately $5,000,000 was lost. There is more than half the cost of this projected Nation-wide program in two States alone. If it is going to take $26,000,000 to put this program over, I am for it. However, I am for taking it out of the hands of the agencies that have proven themselves utterly incapable of handling the task. The recruitment and placement of farm labor should be handled by persons who are familiar with farmers and farm problems.

Yesterday, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] made a very moving argument in behalf of community cooperation. I want the gentleman from Wisconsin to understand that his particular congressional district has no corner on patriotism in that regard.

The President of the United States, following his trip to the Pacific coast, referred to the fine community cooperation in my congressional district, where they closed banking houses and business houses and the citizens of the communities went onto the farms and helped harvest the prune and tomato crops. They did a miraculous job. But that is not enough. When thousands of tons of fresh peaches, thousands of tons of fresh apricots, thousands of tons of prunes or other valuable crops are rotting on the trees and on the ground, community cooperation is not enough. We must have a supplemental supply of labor, and the only place for it to come from now is from Mexico.

The Government of Mexico can do more to implement the good-neighbor policy by assisting the United States in recruiting an adequate supply of farm labor than any other one thing I know of.

As our allies in the present war I am sure everything possible will be done.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this bill be passed as is, and that the pending amendments be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, this bill is worth $26,000,000 for one part of it alone, that is, going back and recognizing local government, where the county commissioners appoint the county agents and the people have really got some voice in their National Government.

The experiment, from a local governmental standpoint, is worthy of consideration. In all probability the speaker addressing you will never be selected to administer the policy of the Nation, but I think there has been too much concentration in Washington, trying to carry out party lines against the welfare of the Nation. There is no reason why this Congress and this Government should not recognize the agricultural bureaus and State boards of agriculture in the respective agricultural States and other agencies that deal with agriculture.

One other thing: We ought to have some practical farmers in authority dealing with the actual farmers, because the documents that have been produced and read in the form of labor contracts, and menus compelling filet mignon a la Stanley for Mexican laborers, goes to show that it was not the idea of a man that knew anything about farming.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. Not now. I will yield when I have concluded.

The people of America are looking to Congress. We have a big job, because we cannot administer the law to where it will work out, with one jurisdiction conflicting with and intertangling with another; but we could send back to the agricultural States our Federal money and recognize our agricultural agents as this bill provides, and when it gets to the county, the county commissioners have authority to veto or O. K. the contract with the county agent. That county agent has to cultivate the good will of the farmers of the county he represents, in order to hold his job.

I am opposed to all amendments save and except the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. I think his amendment will strengthen the bill and stop the useless expense of transporting farm labor from one point of the United States and back a time or two, without results, and I am going along with that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] is recognized.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, this bill, or a part of it, may do some good, but at most I am unable to see where it is going to do very much good, because I do not think it is the proper approach to the problem. This bill would appropriate $26,000,000 to assemble, house, and train farm labor. Frankly, I think if we will take the clamps off of the farmer so he can get a fair price for his products he will be able to find and pay for his own labor.

A strange thing about this bill is that there seems to be a lack of confidence in just what it will accomplish, even on the part of those who advocate it. There are too many "ifs" involved. It is farm or agricultural legislation coming from the Appropriations Committee instead of the Agriculture Committee.

The present O. P. A. Director is exercising more control over not only this problem but over agriculture in general than any other department, man, or organization, including the Congress of the United States today. I do wish the Department of Agriculture would wake up and quit being a "yes" department to O. P. A. officials.

I might say that I am informed that one of the big reasons why Mr. Brown is O. P. A. Director instead of United States Senator from Michigan, the office held by him prior to November 1942, is because he blocked the solution to this very problem last year by opposing the inclusion of labor costs in the price of agricultural commodities and therefore the people decided that maybe Mr. Brown would be better off somewhere else. I suppose he was conscientiously opposed to it then, and is now, for he, Mr. Brown, or the O. P. A., which he heads, leaves approximately $1 or $1.25 per day labor costs in the price of farm commodities. Now you and I know that you cannot get labor on the farms at that price, and so does Mr. Brown and his associates. Labor is now in the competitive field and the Government put it there. You can set up a $50,000,000 outfit, if you want to, with the theory of this bill in mind or for the purpose of assembling, collecting, and training agricultural workers, but, first, you must find the workers; and second, they must agree to work on the farms, and not only have they got to agree to work on the farms, but they must agree to work on the farm for at least half or less than half of the price paid for labor by industry in Government camps, the munitions factories, and so forth.

So where are you? You are just left out in the cold, so far as that is concerned, and the solution to the problem still remains first, more agricultural machinery and second, more money to the farmer for his products, for without more money they will be unable to pay the market price for labor and if the farmer cannot go into the labor market and pay a competitive price, he cannot and will not get it. Why should we try to fool ourselves?

Now, I have great faith and confidence in my friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I want to read some of his words that are just as sound today as they were on September 22, 1942, when he uttered them.

Quoting from the RECORD, the gentleman said:

> Crops already made are not being harvested because, at current prices, they will not bring enough to pay a wage sufficient to draw farm labor away from war industries which have lured it from the farms. Industry can pay large wages because it gets a fair price for its products with the cost of labor figured in, but the farmer cannot pay high wages because, under this bill, you propose to so reduce the price of his product as to leave no margin for increased wages.

And again on the same day he said:

> If you vote for this bill as it is written, as it is presented to you here without amendment—to include the farmer's cost of production as you include every other producer's cost of production—you are voting to prolong the war and you are voting away certainty of early and perhaps complete victory.

Then the gentleman was asked:

> I should like to ask him if it is not his considered judgment that we face a grave shortage of food within the next year unless the farmer is given equal protection with the wage earner of the country?

To which he replied:

> Beyond the peradventure of a doubt the consuming public does not appreciate that fact as yet.

The gentleman stated further:

> In the future when the proponents of low farm prices begin to appreciate the situation it will be too late, it will then be irreparable and the country will understand what this loss means.

And we are now beginning to learn what it means.

He further stated:

> Sweatshop conditions are not permitted in the city, but they are found on every farm. Child labor is prohibited in the factory, but it is the rule on the farm. And now that farm prices are being reduced 10 percent and factory wages raised 15 percent under this bill, is it to be wondered that men are closing down the farms and taking their families to the cities? It is the life of Riley in the city as compared to life on the farm as it will be under the administration of this bill.

This was said during the debate which took place when those of us who were interested in the farmer and understood his problems were trying to get cost of labor included in the formula for parity so that it could not be disregarded in fixing maximum prices on agricultural commodities. We had just as well be plain about it, the big cities and the so-called leaders of industrial workers want cheap food; and they do not care how many hours per day the farmer has to work, they do not care how much child labor is used, they do not care about his standard of living, they want cheap food. And take the position that anyone advocating a fair price for farm produce the only thing that will insure an adequate supply of food, is bringing about inflation. John L. Lewis does not see any inflation in

raising the miners' pay $2 per day. But he and those of his school of thought contend that if you pay the producer of food 50 percent as much in wages as is paid those who produce coal, it would be inflation. I do not believe that position or attitude is fair, honest, good Americanism or to the best interest of this Nation in winning the war, one of the great needs now is for food if we continue to hamper its production we will be hampering and hindering this country's war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

[Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

(Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Chairman of the Committee if I may be permitted to use the additional 5 minutes which it is understood I was to have at the time debate under the 5-minute rule on this amendment was fixed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in my request I asked that the gentleman from South Carolina be accorded 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from South Carolina may proceed for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] for referring to the statement I made way back in 1942. I realized at that time, and the members of my committee realized, just what was going on and just what the people of this country might expect. My committee for many months has been working overtime to get over to the heads of the various agencies connected with our war program, the Congress, and the President of the United States, the position of agriculture, and just what was being done to the farmers instead of being done in the interest of the farmers of this country. At that time I stated that nothing would be done about it until early some morning when those in authority would arise and find nothing to eat; then we should find the different agencies, the Congress, and everybody else running all over each other spending millions trying to do that which cannot be done on the farm overnight. I fear that it is too late now for 1943, but we must do something and do it now, not only to be helpful in 1943 but to take care of 1944.

On yesterday and today we have heard many Members state on the floor of this House that this bill now under consideration will not cure the serious situation confronting the farmers of the country, that is, the labor shortage. Let me say to you that I agree with those gentlemen that it will not. The people in California and perhaps one or two other sections of the country where Mexican labor may possibly be secured may get something out of this bill, and I hope they will. The other day when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] asked any Member who had a surplus of labor in his district to stand and let the Members know about it not a single Member rose to his feet. Perhaps in the South we may be in a little better shape, so far as labor is concerned, than most any other agricultural section of the country, but unless something is done quickly and definitely about this serious situation we are going to remain in the serious position we are insofar as bringing about even a normal production in 1943, when at this time more than any other time in the history of this great Republic we need to increase our production which is so necessary not only to win this war but to win a just and lasting world peace.

I will tell you about the position of agriculture. From the very beginning of our war program the various agencies connected with our war effort have left agriculture out of the picture; they have made a stepchild out of the Department of Agriculture and the farmers of this country. The Manpower Commission and those connected with industry have been interested in getting employees into industry. The employment agencies scattered all over the country have been working overtime sending employees to Government jobs and to war industries.

The War Department stated that so far as agriculture was concerned that was Secretary Wickard's racket. The War Department is interested only in getting every man possible to build up a ten- or fifteen-million-man Army when, as a matter af fact, they cannot possibly get across during 1943 over four to four and a half million men.

In every instance when the Secretary would ask for more critical materials for farm machinery they would make promises, but that is all. The last promise they made was to give 50 percent of the total of 1941. To this good hour, however, they have received perhaps 25 percent; and the distribution of farm machinery implements and repair parts are tied up with red tape. Let me tell you you are not going to produce anything like a normal crop this year with the position the farmers are in today—short of necessary farm machinery, unfair prices, many rules, regulations, and restrictions, and unfair ceilings and farm prices, and the shortage of labor. There is, however, one thing that can be done that will go a long way to help the situation and that is to stop taking farmers, their sons, and laborers from the farms which they are still doing even to the last man in a great many instances. I challenge any Member to stand up and tell me they are not now doing that very thing in his district. They are doing that in my district and they are doing that in your district. They plan to take many more millions into the armed services of this country awaiting the time when it may be possible to take them overseas. There are many trained farmers and trained laborers who can be furloughed back to the farm to do the thing that is necessary to win this war. I want to request the Members to pay strict attention to the reading of an amendment I propose to offer and that I now request, Mr. Chairman, be read for the information of the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the proposed amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to be offered by Mr. FULMER: Page 5, after line 14, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, every individual who was regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor in any capacity in connection with the production of any agricultural commodity during a major part of the calendar year of 1942, and who, on the date of enactment of this joint resolution or on the date thereafter on which such individual receives orders to report for induction into the land or naval forces of the United States, is regularly engaged in any capacity in connection with the production of any agricultural commodity shall be deferred from training and service under such act until January 1, 1944, or until the date on which such individual ceases to be regularly engaged in any capacity in connection with the production of any such commodity, whichever first occurs. As used in the foregoing sentence the term 'production of any agricultural commodity' includes the raising, feeding, caring for, and management of any dairy animals or other livestock or poultry."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the amendment is read at this time for information.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that it may be that this amendment is not germane, but if the gentleman will not raise that point I do not believe there is a single Member of Congress here that will raise the point.

Unless something is done, and done promptly, I hate to think just what will happen in connection with the winning of this war. I am sure you will agree with me you cannot "keep 'em flying" or "keep 'em rolling" unless you can keep them eating. Today millions of people are practically starving in Europe, and we are rationing food in this country at this time. Think for a moment what it would mean in saving the lives of our men if we are able to keep our allies supplied and keep them fighting. This amendment, if adopted, could keep the rest of the people on the farm who have not been drafted. However, the gentleman can make the point of order, and no doubt it will be sustained. But I ask you seriously how you are going to help the farmers of this country to produce a normal crop unless you can keep them down on the farm.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am in heartiest accord with the statement made by the gentleman from South Carolina. In the remarks I myself made on the floor yesterday I called attention to the fact that if exemption of keymen on essential farms had been allowed a year ago, or beginning at the time I made the statement, we would not have today the situation that we are here trying to alleviate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute in view of the fact that I took some of his time.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that there is much that I can add to the discussion of the measure now before us—House Joint Resolution 96. It has been explained and defended very competently by both the majority and minority members of the committee. However, there is one thing that I do want to say to you definitely.

I am heartily in accord with the provisions of this resolution placing the responsibility for the recruiting of farm labor in the hands of the Agricultural Extension Service. This Service in my State is in the hands of a competent and reliable group of men at Purdue University. I rest this problem in their hands.

The Extension Service has a great organization set up all over this country in every agricultural county and State in the Union. They are all ready to go. They are functioning. The farmers have confidence in them. Under the terms of this resolution, they are given $6,000,000 to do what they can to stimulate the recruitment of agricultural labor. If anything can be done to relieve this situation, they are in a position to do it.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard testimony to the effect that, although the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Security Administration have been working on this problem for nearly a year and have expended several million dollars, they have succeeded in recruiting little or no labor. They have failed to even scratch the surface.

I therefore feel that the Congress is thoroughly justified in turning this program over to the Extension Service, a far-flung, effective organization with a record of 70 years of solid accomplishment. At least I am willing to give them the necessary funds and authority to tackle this most important problem. The need for immediate action cannot be disputed. With the threat of food shortages ahead, with all they can mean not only to this country but to our allies, we cannot afford to take chances.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us causes us to realize the more that we are groping in the dark and lost in the wilderness. When the Office of Price Administration bill was before the House, many of us contended that there should be no ceiling on farm commodities. The best we could get was the Brown amendment which established 90 percent of parity.

The O. P. A. ceiling set on farm produce has throttled and threatens to stop farm production. I do not entertain the theory that an increase of farm commodity prices will bring about wild inflation. When the O. P. A. bill was before the House it was determined to put no ceiling on wages, which probably was wise. It was determined at the same time to put a ceiling on agricultural commodity prices. In other words, the philosophy then obtaining was that it is all right to have big wages, it is all right to produce, but we are not concerned about your getting food.

The call to the armed forces and the call of high wages in industry has depleted the supply of labor on the farms and stalled production. We cannot get around the fact that the way to bring about factory production, raw material produce production, and machine production, is to allow the producers to have the certain knowledge that the product will bring the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. If the farmers of this Nation could be assured that their commodities would bring the cost of production and a reasonable profit, the problem would be solved.

In almost every farm county in the United States there is a county agricultural agent, and these men are performing well. Each of them knows what can be produced in his county and how to bring it about. Instead of hunting nostrums as we are in this monstrosity before us, which I shall probably vote for because nothing else is now offered, knowing however it will not answer the emergency. If we should authorize and direct that these county farm agents should stimulate production in an orderly manner in their counties by means of the Commodity Purchasing Corporation of the Department of Agriculture guaranteeing certain prices for the produce of the farm, labor would go to the farm.

Do you think it is practical to go into depleted farm labor areas—and they are all that—and recruit labor and carry it to another depleted farm area? You are robbing Peter to pay Paul. The only method by which you can get this labor is to let the farmer himself get his own labor through the definite knowledge that he will receive the cost of what he produces plus a reasonable profit. You have the machinery already set up through the county farm agents for a plan like this, but the lust of bureaucracy has grown so great in this Nation and percolated so deeply into Congress that you are afraid to challenge it.

It is the duty of the Congress to face this situation in a realistic, practical manner and to apply to the subject business yardsticks. In other words, we should approach this subject the same as any other important business subject in connection with the war effort. In the Department of Agriculture we already have an agency which has been utilized for the purchase of commodities. This agency, with additional power and authority, could very well be used as a Federal purchasing agency for food commodities. It is clear in my mind that if such agency had the power to purchase at stated prices, such power of purchase would rarely be exercised. In other words, the fact that such Federal organization was given the power and direction to purchase food commodities at a certain price would definitely set the price of such commodity, then the usual channels of trade would buy and pay for such commodity the indicated price. I am confident that such purchasing medium would never have to utilize in its operation in excess of $5,000,000—perhaps only $1,000,000.

The county farm agents are already in position to know the food-producing possibilities of their respective counties. They know the individual farms and the majority of the individual farmers on same. The Secretary of Agriculture could immediately arrive at the desired amount needed of each regularly produced food crop. These respective amounts could be disseminated as production goals and prorated according to the ability to produce to the various counties in the country. In fact, such arrangement and promulgations could be, if red tape could be cut, carried forth in less than 10 days. The price so fixed for the various food commodities should be sufficient to give the farmer cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

In fixing this cost of production and price of food commodities at the farm, consideration would be given to sufficient farm wage to be paid as will offer adequate inducement to labor in order that the farmer may be enabled to obtain such labor. The farmer himself, if given sufficient price for his commodity, can undoubtedly secure adequate labor to produce. He should be enabled, in such food-production program, to compete with salaries and wages paid to industrial and war workers adjacent to his farm community. It would be infinitely better for the consumer to pay more for the food that he eats, in an orderly way and through the regular processes and channels of trade and through regular and orderly processes of farm production in the farmers' own manner, than for the Federal Government to appropriate the $26,000,000 as indicated in this bill to attempt to subsidize the farm-labor situation. The American people ultimately will be called upon to pay the $26,000,000 as indicated in this bill. The average American would get his food cheaper if all Price Administration ceilings on farm commodities could be scrapped and if inducements for production were made by guaranteeing to the farmer cost of production plus reasonable profit.

Now, my colleagues, there is no use in trying to fool ourselves. This theoretical, itinerant, migratory, ultra bureaucratic plan before you today is not the solution. The American factory owner is now producing airplanes successfully because he knows in advance that he will get the cost of that airplane plus reasonable profit. This same thing applies in every material, product, and manufactured article used in the war effort. This is a common business principle and the only way we are going to get adequate food production on the farms in America is to apply a similar business

plan. Ceiling prices placed by the O. P. A. on milk produced in the State of Florida are forcing dairymen to sell their cattle for beef and retire from the dairy business. Vegetable and potato growers and long-staple cotton growers in Florida are unable to adequately expand for production because of ceiling and floor prices set by the O. P. A. which are prohibitive and destructive to these industries. These same inadequate ceiling and floor or support prices as set on other commodities has practically stopped production in its tracks.

Yes; some of my colleagues have gloated about the great food production, say, in 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933 of farm produce. I recall that very well. The elevators were bursting with grain; barns were filled with hay; cattle and hogs roamed the pastures and highways; cotton yielded abundantly. But did you ever stop to think about it, at that particular time, there were probably more hungry Americans than at any time during our Nation's existence? Corn sold for 10 cents a bushel; wheat, 15 cents or 20 cents; cotton, 5 cents and 6 cents a pound; pork, beef, and other commodities were low. But the American people were hungry, millions of them, because they had nothing with which to buy food. Factories were idle and farmers were burning corn for fuel because they could not buy coal. Coal miners were hungry for corn and wheat and other edible products because they had no employment and no money with which to buy food. That was under the Republican Administration of President Hoover.

I have at all times favored Government encouragement of abundance of production and have lamented destruction of food things of value. I always doubted the wisdom of the plowing under program and of the hog destruction program. But, my colleagues, that is neither here nor there. We are faced with a serious situation which, unless remedied, will eventually bring hunger to our people and to the Allies depending upon us. And may I suggest to you Members who represent city districts, your constituents may be the first to be hungry because it is expected that the farm producers should first feed their families and then their nearest neighbors. You should be interested in this, and I know you are.

I trust that the Committee on Agriculture will give immediate and serious thought to this matter and agree to legislation which will without red tape delaying and fantastic bureaucracy, inaugurate a program immediately of guaranty of cost of production plus reasonable profit. This is, in my opinion, the only practical and workable method of approach.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] be given as much of my time as he may need.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, about 18 months ago my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] and I started working practically every day on the labor situation as it existed in our State at that time. Many times we consulted with the Department of Agriculture, even the Secretary of Agriculture himself. We pointed out to him time and again that if we expected to harvest crops or plant the crops to produce more food in our State, a program had to be worked out immediately under which additional labor could be brought to the farms. So to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself this is no new program. Both of us are agriculturists, and long ago we had Mexican labor. We secured them, hired them, paid them off at the end of the season, long before we ever heard of the Farm Security Administration, which was supposed to give our people assistance in the way of farming.

The three counties—Kern, Tulare, and Kings—that together comprise the Tenth Congressional District of California in 1942 produced agricultural products valued at more than $175,000,000. These farm products came from a million acres of irrigated lands and 200,000 acres of nonirrigated lands—wheat and barley.

Forty varieties of fruits, 20 kinds of vegetables, 10 major field crops, and 7 kinds of grains are produced in commercial quantities. The value of livestock produced and sold and their products totaled more than $45,000,000.

There is no season of the year when harvesting or planting or processing is not going on.

The planting and harvesting of these crops requires seasonal labor in great numbers for the most valuable of them are extremely perishable and when ready for harvest permit only a short period of time for gathering or they are lost.

In addition to irrigation water which these crops must have, the supply of labor with which to gather them in must be adequate, and now with the whole world on short rations it is inconceivable that either should be curtailed or left lacking. The bungling of the problem of getting farm labor last year was offset somewhat by a very long and favorable harvest season. However, the bungling and stupid handling of those in charge of the program for securing farm labor cannot and should not be condoned, for we have too much at stake.

The present bill might not do everything that is necessary but it is a long step forward in the right direction. We should get rid of the crackpots and desk farmers and make it possible for experienced and practical men to do the job that must be done if the Nation is not to go hungry.

I hold in my hand, Mr. Chairman, a total of more than 75 telegrams that I have received in my office in the last 2 days. They come from an agricultural district. They do not come from politicians. They represent the Grange, the Farm Bureau, individual farmers, chambers of commerce, all right in the heart of the Agricultural Belt, and all in favor of this legislation. How many of you Congressmen here represent an agricultural district that in 1942 produced more than $175,000,000 worth of food and fiber, so essential to our war effort? Mr. Chairman, we need every dime that is in this present bill, to provide that adequate labor be brought in, to continue to produce food for health, and for the winning of the war, and I say to you that the Secretary of Agriculture is responsible for this bungling of the Farm Security Administration. If I had been Secretary of Agriculture, I would have fired the Farm Security Administration a long time ago, and I would not have waited until Congress had to boot them out. I say to you gentlemen, this is serious. This is no longer a matter of the Agriculture Department. It is the duty of Congress to see to it that food is produced for our boys on the firing line, and we should not let them down. Let us see that these boys are fed, and that the boys in the war plants are fed, and that maximum production is had for all. By passing this bill, it will be one of the issues that will go down in history as most essential in our war effort.

I hold in my hand here a transcript of the testimony of a man named Casey Abbott, a farmer from the State of Arizona. He appeared before the Senate Agricultural Committee, and what did he testify to? He pointed out some of the very things that I have told you about and I want to read from his statement, to show what the Farm Security Administration did in the way of providing labor in the State of Arizona. He said:

> We found a large portion of these workers were unfit for any kind of labor, namely, persons in the last stages of tuberculosis, who were told that Arizona was a mecca for such diseases, and that if they could get out there, they might effect a cure, even if they could not work; that they would be given a free medical card and attention and otherwise be taken care of.
>
> There were active cases of syphilis, confirmed alcoholics, and people choked up with asthma, who by their own admission, had not done a day's work in 2 years; women expecting to become mothers any minute, men over 70 years of age and jailbirds with long prison records, as well as old worn-out prostitutes.

That is what Mr. Abbott told the committee that the Farm Security Administration did for the State of Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the 5 minutes allotted to me to the gentleman from Illinois, so that he may have 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, perhaps at this stage of the proceedings it may be well to recapitulate the arguments that have been made for and against the present proposal. I think it is generally agreed that there is a critical food situation. It must be agreed that in the production of food you must have machinery, but that matter is not before us today and is not an issue at the moment. It is agreed that you must have feed and fertilizer, but that matter is not before us today. Many members of this House agree that you must have an adequate price for farm commodities, but that matter is not in controversy today. So we are dealing with the only other element that enters into the food picture, outside of the weather, and manifestly over the weather we have no authority or power, and that is the question of manpower. Therefore, let us confine the issue to the question of whether or not and to what extent we can effect a proposal here that will solve the agricultural manpower problem. There are certain areas of agreement, I think, insofar as I could ascertain from the discussion carried on both yesterday and today. The first one is that if we are going to do something, we are reasonably unanimous at least that it ought to be done by the Extension Service in the Department of Agriculture rather than by the Farm Security Administration, which has been heretofore designated by the Secretary of Agriculture for that purpose. That matter is involved in the O'Neal proposal to substitute for the pending bill. He would restore this power to the Secretary of Agriculture with suitable language in the bill giving him authority to transfer funds not only to any bureau in the Department of Agriculture, but to any bureau or agency in the entire structure of Government.

Having had an opportunity since 1942 and having failed in the endeavor, I see no reason why the Congress should go over that path again. It should exercise its own responsibility, and instead of permitting the Secretary once more to designate the agency that has already failed, let the Congress then say today that it ought to be handled by Extension Service. We are agreed, then, I think in a fair way, that the Extension Service should handle this matter.

Secondly, I think there will be agreement with the Pace amendment, which will safeguard counties, so that employees cannot be taken out of a county if there is a shortage and transported to some other county. And we are agreed with the second provision in the Pace amendment that there should be some safeguarding of county labor. I shall go along with that amendment.

So if we are agreed on Extension Service and if we are reasonably agreed on the Pace amendment to safeguard the States and counties, then the only other controversy before us is the question of amount. The Secretary of Agriculture says he needs $65,000,000. The committee in reporting this resolution says $26,100,000 should suffice to do the job. Our friend, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, offers an amendment striking it down to $12,000,000. The curious argument is that after all this is only a gesture. After all this is a piece of sheer futility. After all we are not going to accomplish anything. After all, where can you find any surplus labor today? If there is any merit in that argument, Mr. Chairman, then why vote any money at all? You might just as well strike the enacting clause. I cannot imagine anybody defending his position by saying that it is a futility, it is a gesture, it will be an abortive effort, and so instead of spending $26,000,000 you will waste only $12,000,000. There is no substance, nor sense nor logic in that kind of argument. You would be in a far more consistent position by striking the enacting clause or by voting no money whatsoever. I am of the opinion that the effect of the effort that we shall here and now propose and enact, if it is enacted, should be implemented with sufficient funds to give the Extension Service a chance to do the job.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. In view of the fact that the gentleman's resolution—and he wrote the resolution—cuts down what the Budget proposed from $65,000,000 to $26,000,000, how can he advance the argument which has just been suggested by him against a further reduction? Why did not the gentleman provide for the $65,000,000 recommended by the Budget?

Mr. DIRKSEN. For the very good reason we feel there is a job to be done and it has been laid out on this proposal that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had mimeographed, and which you will find at the desk. There is a break-down and we sought to follow a consistent program. We do not believe we are going to spend $26,000,000 on an absolute futility; yet the gentleman from Georgia was in the well yesterday and threw up his hands and said, "It is just going to be a waste of money, so instead of wasting $26,000,000 we will just waste $12,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman with the greatest of grace and pleasure.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, I would be glad to see no money appropriated for a futile program, but I sought to secure a compromise. Has not the gentleman frequently adopted the position that this program will be futile, and if so, why does he want to appropriate $26,000,000?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not an issue today as to what the gentleman from Illinois might have done heretofore. He is trying to deal realistically with the problem of agricultural manpower that is before us right now. I do not propose to see any red herring pulled across the trail.

Now, it has been stated there are some States that do not want any help. That may be, but I shall not be so provincial as to say that I am trying to legislate for the State of Illinois or the State of Wisconsin, or the State of West Virginia. This is a program that applies to the 48 States of the Union. You have different farming conditions in different States, and we are undertaking here and now to propose a pattern that will cover the 48 States of the Union.

They say there will be no results because nothing has been done in the price field. I remember speeches in the well of this House when we were dealing with the Office of Price Administration, when Members stated repeatedly, in stentorian tones, that the 90 million or 120 million would be wasted because you could not curb inflation. But we voted the money. I remember when they argued here year after year that the $1,400,000,000 that we spent on W. P. A. would not solve the unemployment problem; but we voted the money. So today it seems to be the better part of common sense on the part of Congress that in designating the Extension Service for this purpose, they be given sufficient funds with which to do the job. If they should fail, certainly the Congress will have discharged its responsibility.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was not the original request—of which this bill is an abridgment—for $65,000,000, a part of which was to build a lot of camps for housing which are not regarded as needed? Do we not have enough housing by taking the camps now under the Farm Security and also the discarded C. C. C. camps, to provide the needed housing? Does not this bill seek maximum use of what we have without new housing?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That provision is in the pending resolution, that housing, insofar as needed, as determined by the Extension Service, will be utilized?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Apropos of the amount that may be necessary, I understood the gentleman to endorse the Pace amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HOPE. Does not the gentleman think, if that amendment is adopted, the amount which will be necessary for the Extension Service to spend will be greatly reduced, because, in my judgment, no county agent, no State agricultural commissioner is going to affront the farmers of his State by permitting any agricultural labor to go out of that county or State?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The agricultural commissioners of the States can send any surplus labor that is developed, and it is very largely a matter of policy of transporting the laborer outside of the county.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. I submit that the amendment should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, appropriations and the amount of appropriations will not solve the farm-labor problem, just as they did not solve the problem of unemployment. The President of the United States allocated $5,000,000 to provide for the solution of this problem for the past season.

The Tarver amendment proposes to allocate $12,100,000, or twice the amount allocated by the President.

It is generally agreed that the program, under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, has not only been a failure, but it is thoroughly discredited. The pending bill would utilize the Extension Service, and I think that while the benefits may be doubtful, it is a vast improvement over the existing program. It would be almost tragic to substitute the O'Neal bill for the pending measure, for it perpetuates a program that is thoroughly discredited.

The purpose of this bill is to provide and distribute labor. Labor is permanent; labor is seasonal. Labor does not go from one farm to another, or from a farm in one State to another farm in another State. It goes into industry because industry is offering better advantages and higher wages. The employment agencies often recruit for industries, but under the Extension Service they must not further deplete farm labor.

I am very doubtful about the provisions of this bill, except as this bill under the administration of the Extension Service, may succeed in bringing in Mexican and West Indies labor. There is a scarcity of labor, both seasonal and permanent, in every State in the Union. We might as well face the facts. The principal source of any additional labor will be from Mexico or the West Indies. The appropriation of $12,100,000, twice the amount allocated by the President, will give to the Extension Service an opportunity to try this matter out and if the amount is not sufficient, that Service can come back to the Congress and in another appropriation bill ask for an additional amount of money.

What agency of the Government or what witness before the committee that reported this bill ever stated that $26,100,000 would solve this problem? Let us be reasonable about this matter. We have a farm-labor problem. Many factors enter into it. We are discussing one, and that is the matter of supplying and distributing labor, and when the industries and the Selective Service have gotten the farm workers, we have got to do what the manufacturers of New England did following the War between the States. They imported foreign labor. We can give the Extension Service an opportunity to solve this problem by adopting reasonable and sound measures for the importation of labor that may be available in the nearby countries. Now, I would like to say that if the Extension Service will use the same good, common sense that the Southern cotton farmers in Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas used in the First World War, when in Ford trucks they went across the border into Mexico, selected desirable laborers, brought them back, paid a head charge, and returned the laborers to their homes after the crops had been harvested. Treating the laborers fairly, I think, the Extension Service can aid in solving the problem.

In executing the terms of the pending bill there should be no movement either from one county to another or from one State to another that results in an undersupply of farm labor in the county or the State from which the labor is removed. Farms have been depleted by the high wages of industry and by the selective service. They must not be further depleted by the labor being carried from one county to another or from one State to another. There should be provision for clearance with appropriate county and State authorities so that county and State needs will not be jeopardized by either seasonal or permanent labor being transported from one county to another or from one State to another. The Pace amendment is imperative. I am glad that the committee in charge has agreed to accept the Pace amendment. It makes the pending bill much more satisfactory.

Both agriculture and industry look more and more to the Government to solve their problems. I believe that farmers themselves could supply the labor needed if they were permitted to bring it in for seasonal purposes from Mexico and from the outlying West Indies. The matter could be handled by the Extension Service under contract with farmers to return the labor to the border or to the port after they had completed their work. The need is for more labor. It must be supplied by importing it from other countries or by reasonable transportation within the States from one State to another with the definite assurance that the labor will be returned to the State from which it was moved. Provision could be made within the State for the return of the labor that is transported from one county to another to the county from which it came. The pending bill if properly administered should aid in the solution of the farm-labor problem. If farmers are disappointed and if the program fails, the Extension Service will suffer irreparable loss.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] is recognized.

(Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to read the amendment I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will informally report the amendment to be offered by the Delegate from Hawaii.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARRINGTON, Delegate from Hawaii:

On page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words "and Puerto Rico."

On page 2, line 15, strike out the words "and Puerto Rico."

On page 5, line 15, after the word "act", insert the following: *"Provided further,* That the term 'States' or 'State' as used herein, include Puerto Rico and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska."

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to extend the provisions of House Joint Resolution 96 to the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. The inclusion of Alaska is made at the request of Delegate ANTHONY J. DIMOND, of that Territory.

The resolution as reported by the committee provides that the funds appropriated shall "be expended under the supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agricultural services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States and in Puerto Rico."

So far as I know, there are no plans to extend this service to the Territory of Hawaii. I am not in a position to say that this is necessary or advisable at the present time. This does not mean, however, that the eventuality may not develop. I think it is an error, therefore, to pass this legislation limiting it to the States and Puerto Rico, particularly in view of the important position of Hawaii in the scheme of national defense.

Moreover, the Territory of Hawaii asks for treatment on the basis of equality with the States in all legislation of this kind. This is not only a matter of simple justice. It is sound public policy.

The Territory of Hawaii has, for all practical purposes, carried all the responsibility of a State for almost 40 years. The people of the islands contribute to the Federal Treasury on the same basis as a State, and are prepared to carry all the responsibilities of the citizens of the States. The war has given new emphasis to these responsibilities.

The record of the civilian population, constituting some half million people, since the infamous attack of December 7, 1941, amply justifies the confidence which has been reposed in them and vindicates the generous policy of the Federal Government in dealing with this Territory.

The attitude of the people of the islands toward the many Federal agencies, when called upon to contribute to the development of the islands as a defensive and offensive base, has been one of wholehearted cooperation. The record of Hawaii's civil population since the outbreak of war deserves all the praise that it has won from civil and military leaders alike.

I am sure, therefore, that no effort should be lost to strengthen any Federal agency that may be called upon to

function in this area so vital to the entire country.

I think, therefore, that the extension of the measure, such as that now before the committee, to the islands, while in itself may appear to be a small matter, is of real importance to national defense as well as the development of sound national policy in dealing with the territories.

I have conferred with the chairman of the committee on this amendment and he has expressed himself as agreeable to the change. I ask, therefore, that it be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, there are one or two things I want to say about this matter. I have listened as attentively as I could to the debate of the last 2 days and at least two or three issues seem to be in the minds of the Members. First, do we provide in this bill too much money?

As to that, I only want to say I do not think there is anybody on this floor who can accurately measure the amount of money that can be intelligently spent. We have on the Deficiency Committee, which reported this bill, the chairman of every subcommittee in the Appropriations Committee, and I trust their judgment. Their action is further reviewed by the entire Appropriations Committee, consisting of 43 members.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman's statement is inaccurate. We do not have the chairman of every subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the Deficiency Committee.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman is correct and my statement was wrong. I should have said that the majority members on that committee are chairmen of subcommittees and that it embraces a majority of all subcommittee chairmen. These men have studied the problem. The matter was referred to the Appropriations Committee, 43 members, that represent nearly one-tenth of the membership of this House. They have studied it as carefully as they know how and they have reported this bill out. I do not think they say it is the final or the last word, but they have tried hard to bring you a good bill and they feel that $26,000,000 is a fair figure.

Let me say in reply to the claim that the money is going to be frittered away that we surely have tried to establish checks and balances to keep that from happening. We have appointed a committee of auditors under the Appropriations Committee, the function of which is to go out and see to it that the money is properly spent. I believe we have full justification to say that this bill will work.

Secondly, another question comes up under the O'Neal amendment as to whether we have reached out and taken the right agency to handle this, whether we could handle it by the Extension agents supplemented by the Extension Service, as the bill provides, and I support, or whether we should handle it through the Farm Security Administration. I am not here to criticize the Farm Security Administration program of handling those affairs which deal with the placing of people on farms or the financial aid to small farmers. But I do question what they have done in employment. I questioned yesterday what they have done as an employment agency, and my reason is this: We have tried to establish in this country a system of Nation-wide free employment agencies under the United States Employment Service. Any time you set up a separate agency to handle farm labor or a separate agency to handle seamen's labor or shipbuilding labor, or anything else, you tear down the principle of a Nation-wide free employment service. You should not do that. There should be a Nation-wide employment service working which keeps track of labor shortages and surpluses.

Under the appropriation bill as it stands, Resolution 96, it will be possible for the Extension Service to survey the field locally, then call upon the Nation-wide service of the United States Employment Service to exchange surplus labor if any exists in any other parts of the country. I think you gentlemen who represent labor districts should remember that everything we pass here should try to build up over this country a good Nation-wide employment service and should not be broken down to farm sections or shipbuilding sections or any other kind of sections.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true with respect to the amount authorized or appropriated in this bill, that practically all of it is for transportation and subsistence and if they do not bring the labor in, the money is not spent?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman is correct. If the labor is not brought in, then the great proportion of the money is not spent. Let me bring this picture to you:

If you establish two separate agencies, one the United States Employment Service recruiting industrial labor which it is now doing and the other the Farm Security Administration recruiting farm labor, as it has done, you could easily have in this country the spectacle of people standing on the street corners, the Employment Service bidding for labor for industry and the Farm Security group bidding for farm labor. They would bid up labor prices and make it impossible for the farmers of this country to obtain labor. Farmers cannot bid against industrial machines, and you must not force them to. You have got to let the United States Employment Service survey the whole field and see where it can most advantageously allot labor.

Finally, I want to ask whether it can be effective. I do know that it can be applied, for instance, to the border States. The men from California, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico have urged that it will give Nation-wide relief and we ought at least to give it a trial. I urge you to support the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah, [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be used by the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. TARVER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the gentleman who preceded me as to the manner in which this estimate has been handled and as to its having been considered by the subcommittee upon which he stated was every chairman of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, I desire to make this short additional statement: This estimate under ordinary procedure which has been followed in connection with appropriations or estimates for appropriations for other departments of the Government, would have normally been referred to the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. You will recall that less than 2 weeks ago the gentleman from California, chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, brought before the House a deficiency estimate for the Navy Department which had been considered by the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations and had been referred by the chairman of the full committee to that subcommittee for attention.

This estimate is for expenditure in the main during the next fiscal year, but it was not referred to the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for consideration, although that subcommittee has given a great deal of time to the investigation of the problems which are sought to be dealt with by this appropriation. I am not particularly jealous of the jurisdiction of the subcommittee of which I happen to be chairman. I do not happen to be a member of the deficiency subcommittee, although I was invited to attend some of its sessions, and did attend, as did other members of my subcommittee; but I submit that if a question affecting deficiency appropriations for the Navy Department should be referred to the Naval Subcommittee on Appropriations, then estimates of this type having to do with agriculture and the operations of the Department of Agriculture should be referred to the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

If that had been done this bill would not be before you today in the shape it is. Four of the seven members of the Agriculture Subcommittee voted in support of my motion in the full committee to cut down the appropriation from $26,100,000 to $12,100,000. So my amendment represents the judgment as expressed in the full committee of a majority of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. I thought you ought to have that information for whatever it might be worth.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman will recall as will other members of the committee—I do not believe a single speaker in the 2 days that we have been considering this bill has held out the thought or hope that any very immediate or quickly beneficial results could come from this legislation. If this be true, does not the gentleman feel that if we give the Extension Service and the Employment Service $12,000,000 now that they could go on with the work and if they really met the need and can show results, Congress still being in session, they could show their need and receive an additional appropriation?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman I believe knows my unfaltering interest in agriculture. If I felt that $26,000,000 or $65,000,000 could be advantageously used I should be in favor of appropriating it. I think this is all the money, and more money, in fact, $12,100,000, than they will have any opportunity of spending to good advantage in the near future; and as the gentleman says, Congress, if additional need can be shown, can make additional appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks in the RECORD.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I do not pose as a farm expert. I am not. I do represent the largest agricultural area in the State of Massachusetts, with many fine farmers in my district. They prefer, apparently, to have their direction come from the county extension service.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with this bill, but it is a beginning of a plan. Eventually, we should have a more carefully thought-out plan. I believe it should all be administered by one department. And without a carefully thought-out organization to insure to farmers labor on their farms, labor that they can count upon, otherwise the measure cannot succeed.

I have always felt that agriculture should be considered an essential war measure. I have been greatly disturbed that no efficient farm plan has been started to insure complete farm production. We must feed our people, and we are likely to have to feed many of the people of Europe, in my opinion. We will have to use trained women on the farms. I introduced a bill for that purpose which would provide for a voluntary war farm corps of women. I saw yesterday the tragic and pitiful pictures made and described by Dr. Therise Bonney of the starving children of Europe. I never will forget those so long as I live. It makes me all the more anxious that agriculture should progress at a rapid rate in our own country. Great agricultural production immediately is imperative.

May I say also that importing labor from other countries will mean feeding more mouths. I am not trying to keep the farmers from having their labor—far from it—but every laborer who comes into this country should be examined to find out whether or not he is loyal, whether or not he is a real Mexican. Many Nazis can come in under the guise of being Mexican labor. Under the laws of Mexico, refugees can become citizens very quickly, as you all know. Members have stated on the floor that this labor is to be returned to Mexico after seasonal work is finished in the United States. That should be done.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I wish to make it clear to the Committee, without having any time after the vote on the Tarver amendment, that I have at the Clerk's desk an amendment which will go further than the Tarver amendment in that it reduces the amount of money to be allotted to the Agricultural Extension Service to $6,025,000, and eliminates entirely the amount of money to be allotted to the United States Employment Service. This would bring the resolution in line with the thinking of a great many Members of the House in that we would allot only that amount of money considered a minimum necessity for the experiment of trying the Extension Service.

Because the amendment strikes out a large part of the language on page 3 of the bill, it of course is not eligible as a substitute to the Tarver amendment, but it is at the Clerk's desk, and immediately after we have voted on the Tarver amendment I intend to ask for the consideration of this amendment.

I explain again that it cuts the amount to $6,025,000. It leaves only that bare amount in the bill for the minimum necessities of the Extension Service to experiment where all else has apparently failed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I ask to be recognized for debate, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The name of the gentleman from Kansas was included in the list handed to him by the Clerk of Members desiring recognition. The Chair called the name of the gentleman some time ago. The Chair has gone down the list, in an effort to be fair to everyone. The Chair regrets to inform the gentleman that all time has now been consumed except the final 10 minutes which, under agreement of the House, is to be divided between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, your committee was presented with an estimate of $65,000,000. A part of that $65,000,000 was $6,000,000 for the Extension Service in the States to operate the recruitment, training, and placement program of farm workers within the States. That item is included in this bill. The rest of that item as it was brought to us was represented to be for the Farm Security Administration expense. In view of the operations of that organization, and their failure to function, to produce results in any possible way, the committee felt that they did not present a proposition that was possible. We recognized the very seriousness of this farm situation and the need for food. Unless we have that food, we are going to be seriously handicapped in our war efforts. The $6,000,000 for the recruitment, training, and placement of farm workers within the States, to be allocated to the Extension Service will, I know, produce very substantial results. I know how that set-up is organized. I know that it is already working at it as far as it can, and that it needs extra money in my territory. The other items are items to bring people in from outside the county, and for the temporary housing of farm labor that is brought in. It has been brought into my own territory in the last 3 or 4 years, in quite substantial number, and it is needed there. We were unable to find an agency until the Extension Service came before us that would undertake the job of handling this outside labor, outside the State and outside the country, that we could trust. The Extension Service came before us and their executive committee went to work upon it and laid out this program whereby we could cut the estimate from $65,000,000 to $26,000,000, and still do the job. I see what troubles the people in California, in New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas. I know what trouble my own people are in in the vegetable industry. It is absolutely impossible to take care of it the way it is done. I felt that we had to do something. The committee felt that way. The Director of the Extension Service, Dr. Simons, of Cornell University, New York, and Mr. Ramsauer, of Ohio, the director there, came before us and presented this estimate. This break-down that I have here is available for anybody who wants it at the Clerk's desk. They also presented a resolution of their executive committee after long consideration of 2 or 3 days, setting up the program and saying they were ready to tackle the job. I believe we ought to let them tackle it. I do not believe that we ought to cut the money down so that they cannot do a job. I do not want them to say that the Congress is to blame for not giving them money, for their not having enough force to work, and I want to see the job done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, before I take the floor I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of this debate all amendments that have been sent to the desk for notice and all others coming up in the course of the consideration of the bill shall be considered, without further discussion, seriatim in order in which presented.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we are to decide here in the next few minutes a question which is today arousing apprehension on every farm, and at every dinner table in America. Already there is a more alarming shortage of food throughout the country than distributors in touch with the situation care to acknowledge. You cannot, this afternoon, go into the average food shop of any city in the Nation and buy everything you want to eat, and the situation grows increasingly and progressively worse as time goes by. The situation cannot be remedied without increased production on the farm. To increase production we must have labor, and farm labor cannot be secured unless we do something about it here this afternoon. Now the question is, Do you want to do anything? Do you want to make any effort to solve this problem in which is involved, not only the question of sufficient food for the average family but the winning of the war? If you do, it must be done here and now.

There are in the last analysis only two issues before us in this bill. First, will you adopt the method recommended by the committee and, second, will you provide enough money to do the job?

It is just as inconsistent, Mr. Chairman, to send to the front the best machine gun in the world, and not send with it sufficient ammunition to keep it firing, as it is to adopt the plan agreed upon here today, and not give them sufficient money with which to put it into effect. We have already cut this estimate down from $65,000,000 to $26,000,000. That is the irreducible minimum if our purpose is to provide any farm labor at all. You can buy $26,000,000 worth of labor or you can buy $12,000,000 worth of labor. Which do you want to give the farmers? Which do you think the farmers want? Which do you think the consumers want the farmers to have? What is really needed? Do they need $26,000,000 worth of labor on the farms of America or do they need $12,000,000 worth of labor? I do not have to tell you that they need not only $26,000,0000 worth of labor but that they need a billion dollars worth of labor if it could be supplied—and that if available, it would provide not only needed food but would help to win this war and would help to shorten the war.

Mr. Chairman, the committee which reported this bill is not only the largest committee but it is one of the most carefully selected committees of the House. It is composed of 43 members, all of them veterans. They have given this bill exceptional consideration. The estimate came up from the Budget along with the estimates for the deficiency bill and it was our intention to include it as a part of that bill. But when we got into it we found it affected matters of such importance and involved so many controversial questions that we had to defer it in order to give it further study and reported out and passed the deficiency bill without it. We have had it under consideration ever since and after the most painstaking deliberation we submit this solution. It may not be perfect but it is the composite product of the judgment and experience of the 43 men and is the best we can do. We offer it to you as the most practical approach to the problem we have been able to devise. The report is not unanimous but it was approved by an overwhelming majority of the members of the committee.

Time is short. Something must be done and done now. The question you are now voting on is whether you will give enough and give it in time or whether you will give too little and too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. TARVER, as follows:

On page 2, line 18, after the words "the sum of", strike out "$26,100,000" and insert "$12,100,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were ayes 86 and noes 111.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. TARVER and Mr. CANNON of Missouri to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 104, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: On page 4, line 7, after the colon following the word "services", insert *"Provided further,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county; or for the transportation of any worker outside of the limits of the State where he resides or is working without the prior consent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture for such State, or other official who performs similar functions for such State."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is acceptable to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, which is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: On page 5, line 7, after the word "impose", insert "unreasonable."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair state that pursuant to a unanimous consent request by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], amendments are being taken up in the order in which they were offered.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PLOESER: On page 2, line 18, after the word "of", strike out "$26,100,000" and insert "$6,025,000"; and in line 19 strike out "$100,000" and insert "$25,000"; and in line 21 strike out "$13,500,000" and insert "$6,000,000"; and on page 3, line 4, strike out all of line 4 after the semicolon and all of lines 5 to 19 and all of line 20, to the word "the" in that line.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULMER: On page 5, after line 14, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, every individual who was regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor in any capacity in connection with the production of any agricultural commodity during a major part of the calendar year 1942, and who, on the date of enactment of this joint resolution or on the date thereafter on which such individual receives orders to report for induction into the land or naval forces of the United States, is regularly engaged in any capacity in connection with the production of any agricultural commodity shall be deferred from training and service under such act until January 1, 1944, or until the date on which such individual ceases to be regularly engaged in any capacity in connection with the production of any such commodity, whichever first occurs. As used in the foregoing sentence the term 'production of any agricultural commodity' includes the raising, feeding, caring for, and management of any dairy animals or other livestock or poultry."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] makes the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this bill. Does the gentleman from South Carolina desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. House Joint Resolution 96 provides an appropriation for supplying and distributing farm labor. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina in effect amends the Selective Training and Service Act by providing for certain deferments. Legislation affecting the Draft Act automatically comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Military Affairs, not the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Agriculture. Therefore, in the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] is not germane to the pending resolution, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARRINGTON:

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words "and in Puerto Rico."

Page 2, line 15, strike out the words "and Puerto Rico."

Page 5, line 14, after the word "Act", insert "*Provided further*, That the term 'States' or 'State' as used herein, includes Puerto Rico and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 5, before the period in line 14, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to compel any person to submit involuntarily to transportation, placement, or service as an agricultural worker."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio), there were—ayes 54, noes 106.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

The amendment offered by Mr. O'NEAL follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'NEAL: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That for expenses necessary for the formulation, development, and execution, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and either independently or in cooperation with individuals or agencies, public or private, of a plan to assist in providing an adequate supply and distribution of labor, including sharecroppers and tenants (including aliens), for the production of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, including (1) recruiting, placement, and transportation of such labor within the continental United States and elsewhere, including transportation of their families and household effects; (2) furnishing, by loans, grants, or otherwise, of medical services, training, subsistence, and shelter; (3) construction or lease and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services; (4) employment of persons (including aliens) and organizations, by contract or otherwise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (5) purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; (6) printing and binding; (7) acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; and (8) travel expenses of persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating capacities from a foreign country to the United States and return, including such expenses to first-duty stations; there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $26,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943: *Provided*, That expenditures may be made hereunder without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That whenever labor shall be furnished hereunder to any other agency, public or private, or individual, this appropriation shall be reimbursed for expenditures on account of wages paid to such labor and other expenditures in connection therewith to the extent which the Secretary may determine to be practicable: *Provided further*, That effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3 of the act of June 29, 1936 (40 U. S. C. 433), receipts derived for the account of the United States from the use and occupancy of labor supply centers, including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That not less than $6,000,000 of the appropriation herein shall be allocated for use by or under the direction of the Extension Service and transfers may be made, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, from $20,000,000 of this appropriation to any bureau or office of the Department of Agriculture, or to any other agency of the Government, which is assigned functions in connection herewith, in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944: *Provided further*, That any payments made by the United States or private employers to aliens under this program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code: *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation herein made nor any of the funds heretofore appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of sections 3 (f), 7 (c), and 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'NEAL) there were—ayes 28, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 96, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, directed him to report the resolution back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LAMBERTSON moves to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Appropriations with directions to report the same back forthwith with amendments as follows:

On page 2, line 18, strike out "$26,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$12,100,000."

On page 2, line 21, strike out "$13,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,000,000."

On page 3, line 4, strike out "$12,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. As I understand it this is the substance of the Tarver amendments, is it not?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no knowledge as to that.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. On the motion to recommit, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOFFMAN) there were—ayes 195, noes 81.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill may have 5 days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the Consent Calendar will be called.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ARTHUR A. SCHIPKE

The Clerk called the first bill, S. 171, for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arthur A. Schipke, of Meriden, Conn., the sum of $148.15, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for property damage resulting from a collision between his automobile and a Department of Agriculture truck in Union, Conn., on March 10, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. PAUL ROGER ZAHLMANN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 173, for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST and Mr. MADDEN objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MRS. ERNESTINE FUSELIER SIGLER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 405, for the relief of Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler, of Oberlin, La., the sum of $1,200, in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her and for expenses incurred as the result of an accident, involving an Army truck engaged in Third Army maneuvers on September 25, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VODIE JACKSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 517, for the relief of Vodie Jackson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Vodie Jackson, of Obion County, Tenn. (post office address, Fulton, Ky.), the sum of $3,686, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when his wagon, in which he was riding, was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck near Fulton, Ky., on October 18, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT T. GROOM, DAISY GROOM, AND MARGARET GROOM TURPIN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 518, for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom Turpin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, his wife, and Margaret Groom Turpin, his daughter, all of Murfreesboro, Tenn., the respective sums hereinafter specified in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States arising out of a collision which occurred near Murfreesboro, Tenn., on October 21, 1941, when an automobile driven by Robert H. Pate, a United States mail carrier, ran into the automobile of the said Robert T. Groom: To the said Robert T. Groom, $952 as compensation for property damage and other damages sustained by him; to the said Daisy Groom, $4,000 as compensation for all damages, including hospitalization, suffered by her; and to the said Margaret Groom Turpin, $3,500 as compensation for all damages, including hospitalization, suffered by her: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOLINROSS CHEMICAL CO., INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 243, conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Bolinross Chemical Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. PRIEST objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MRS. C. A. LEE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 553, for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. C. A. Lee, of Ivy, Tenn., administratrix of the estate of her deceased son, Ross Lee, the sum of $10,000. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for all loss and damages sustained by her on account of injuries sustained by the death of said Ross Lee, who was fatally injured in an accident by a United States owned truck (Civilian Conservation Corps) on October 9, 1937, between Reliance and Ivy, Tenn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after "of," strike out the remainder of line 7 and all down to and including "Tennessee" in line 2 on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$5,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for, and expenses incident to, the death of the said Ross Lee, who was killed by a United States Civilian Conservation Corps truck, driven by Archie Carroll, an enrollee, between Reliance and Ivy, Tenn., on October 9, 1937."

Page 2, after line 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Payment shall not be made until the above named claimant has released all claims and judgments against the said Archie Carroll, in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee, administratrix of the estate of Ross Lee, deceased."

FRANK BORAH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1081, for the relief of Frank Borah.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the

Mur

9. Whereas in reciprocal trade agreements there have been departures from the program originally outlined: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge if any such trade agreements be made or if existing agreements be extended in the future, it be only with the consent and advice of the Congress of the United States.

10. Whereas recent reports have indicated the plan for meat rationing contemplates a ration of only 1¾ pounds per capita per week (including cheese); and

Whereas this amounts to only slightly more than 10,000,000,000 pounds annually, less than half the estimated production for this year; and

Whereas with more than 78,000,000 cattle in the country a sudden increase in marketing, due to drought or other unforeseen emergency, might bring about a serious market condition: Therefore be it

Resolved, That because of the perishable nature of the product rationing be started on a basis more in line with the available supply, as rationing below that level may bring many serious complications.

11. Whereas there is today a maladjustment of freight rates on our products to the Pacific coast which makes it impractical to move them west except alive; and

Whereas there is a big demand on the Pacific coast for pork and beef, since the increasing population must be fed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge that freight rates on packing-house products and fresh meat from the Midwest to the Pacific coast be reduced so that Kansas and other midwestern producers of livestock may sell their products, either alive or dead, free from freight discriminations.

12. Whereas the livestock producers of this State are making every effort to increase production and marketing of livestock; and

Whereas trucks provide an essential and necessary method of transportation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge: (A) That the speed of trucks transporting livestock and other perishable products be increased to a speed at which they will operate at the maximum of efficiency in the conservation of rubber, gasoline, parts, and manpower. (B) That we are opposed to the issuance of any orders or regulations restricting any form of transportation to a given distance such as 250 or 300 miles as is now being considered by the Federal authorities; also be it

Resolved, That drivers of trucks engaged in transportation of livestock and agricultural products be considered as essential to the war effort.

13. Whereas existing credit facilities, both Federal and private, are more than ample; and

Whereas cattle numbers have expanded greatly in recent years: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we express our grave concern over the revival of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation because of the danger of further and unwise expansion in cattle production.

14. In view of the increased demands being made upon the railroads, we recommend their service to the livestock industry.

15. We commend the livestock commission men and marketing agencies for making collections for the National Live Stock and Meat Board.

16. We commend the National Live Stock and Meat Board for its splendid work with the armed forces of the United States of America in cutting and preparing meats.

17. We recommend a continued effort toward the adoption of more uniform sanitary regulations between States.

18. We commend the Kansas Bureau of Investigation for its work toward eliminating the hazard of livestock thefts.

19. We recommend the State livestock sanitary commissioner continue his activities and regulations in supervising community sales of Kansas.

20. We express our appreciation to the ladies who served on the several committees, also to the men of the reception and arrangements committees.

21. We wish to thank each and every one who contributed to our program.

22. We do approve and urge the legislature now in session to enact into law Senate bills 240 and 241 and their companion House bills. These measures strengthen the present community sales law, make more effective the State branding law, provide machinery and means for cattle inspection, and set up a much needed livestock board in Kansas. We believe their adoption will materially advance the interests of the livestock industry in Kansas.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 1780. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 123).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 218. A bill for the relief of H. F. Mathis; without amendment (Rept. No. 124); and

H. R. 402. A bill for the relief of Frank T. Been; without amendment (Rept. No. 125).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 135. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 126).

By Mr. TYDINGS (for Mr. Glass), from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 1648. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 127).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1785. A bill for the relief of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 128).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills reported that that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On March 17, 1943:

S. 786. An act to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

On March 19, 1943:

S. 303. An act to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Samuel M. Derrick, from the State of South Carolina, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

A. Frederick Smith, from the State of Florida, to be senior economist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission; and

James J. Carney, Jr., from the State of Florida, to be program control technician, at $4,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mrs. CARAWAY:

S. 889. A bill granting a pension to Maurice E. Welton, alias Charles E. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 890. A bill to provide for the extension of patents for a period equal to the period during which owners are unable to derive benefits from them on account of the war emergency; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 891. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Collins and W. W. Collins; to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 892. A bill for the relief of William H. Linhart; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 893 (by request). A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137) to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 894 (by request). A bill to provide improvement in the administration of parole; and

S. 895. A bill to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 896. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 897. A bill to amend the act known as the Insecticide Act of 1910 (36 Stat. 331), approved April 26, 1910; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 898. A bill to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 899. A bill to amend the act approved January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

S. 900. A bill to restore Capt. Lara P. Good, retired, to the active list of the United States Army; and

S. 901. A bill to authorize the issuance of service medals to members of the American Expeditionary Force who participated in the occupation of Siberia in 1918–20; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 902. A bill for the relief of Christine W. Ransberger; to the Committee on Claims.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 401. An act for the relief of James W. Kelly;

H. R. 553. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee, administratrix of the estate of Ross Lee, deceased;

H. R. 944. An act for the relief of Douglas R. Muther;

H. R. 1081. An act for the relief of Frank Borah;

H. R. 1219. An act for the relief of Fred Taylor;

H. R. 1238. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles J. Bair;

H. R. 1278. An act for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Richard Stever;

H. R. 1315. An act for the relief of George Henry Bartole and Vernon Wayne Tennyson;

H. R. 1522. An act for the relief of Morton Fiedler;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Klein;

H. R. 1838. An act for the relief of Lucia Humble;

H. R. 1845. An act for the relief of Ted Vaughan, deceased;

H. R. 1874. An act for the relief of Robert P. Sick;

H. R. 1875. An act for the relief of Carl Swanson, Geraldine Cecelia Swanson, a minor, and Almer Swanson;

H. R. 1893. An act for the relief of George H. Crow;

H. R. 1942. An act for the relief of Henry B. Tucker; and

H. R. 2003. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims against the United States of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 441. An act for the relief of Charles Molnar;

H. R. 480. An act for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli;

H. R. 771. An act for the relief of Fisil Rosenberg and his wife, Sofie;

H. R. 772. An act for the relief of M. L. Leopold Rosenberg and his wife, Lisa;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of George M. Louie;

H. R. 1467. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal; and

H. R. 2016. An act for the relief of William H. Linhart; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson; and

H. R. 1724. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition's East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941, and for other purposes; to the calendar.

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS—TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS (for Mr. GLASS) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

On page 13, line 5, after the word "Treasury", to insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That field employees of the War Savings Staff may be reimbursed, at not to exceed 3 cents per mile, for travel performed by them in privately owned automobiles while engaged in the promotion of the sale of United States Government securities (estimated War Savings bonds) within the limits of their official stations."

On page 33, line 25, after "Bureau of Accounts", to insert the following: "including the employment of temporary personnel by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the civil service and classification laws, for the purpose of making studies of the cost, rating and accounting procedures of the Postal Service."

Mr. TYDINGS also (for Mr. GLASS) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. GLASS to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

TEMPORARY CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 116), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 251, agreed to June 4, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ an additional clerk during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1942, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect from July 1, 1943, until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

LANDS FOR GRAZING PURPOSES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF LETTER AND PROPOSED BILL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on March 16 there came from the Secretary of the Interior a letter, with a proposed bill attached. A notation to that effect appears on page 2068 of the RECORD. The letter, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The subject matter of the proposed bill and letter pertain entirely to grazing. It was undoubtedly erroneously referred, and I respectfully ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of the letter, and that it, together with the proposed bill, be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the able Senator from Nevada spoke to me about that matter a moment ago. Most of the grazing takes place on the public domain, and the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys has jurisdiction over that Government property. There is some grazing in the national forests and some on Indian reservations. I think properly this letter should have been referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and not to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That is my judgment under the construction of the rules of the Senate and the practices incidental thereto.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, what was the proposed bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. The matter came from the Department of the Interior and deals entirely with grazing.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the change of reference will be made as requested.

CONTROL OF PORK PRICES AND PRICE CEILING ON LIVE ANIMALS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate a petition signed by various farmers in Minnesota and North Dakota. The petition is dated Casselton, N. Dak., under date of March 15, 1943, and is addressed to Mr. Marvin Jones, White House, Washington, D. C. It reads in part:

We, the undersigned, farmers of the Red River Valley of North Dakota, are opposed to the proposed plan of the Government to control pork prices to eliminate the black market by the establishment of ceiling prices for live hogs. Ceiling prices for live hogs would not control live-hog values because weight, grade, dockage, and fill are all factors which directly influence hog values. If ceiling prices are to be established, then sale weights established by disinterested weightmasters over scales officially tested would be necessary to prevent the creation of ideal conditions for black-market operations through the establishment of weights. It would also be as necessary to establish uniform grades for all hog-producing territories and have disinterested trained hog men do the grading, as it would be to fix a ceiling price. Grading provides just as effective opportunities for black-market operations as does price.

The same is true with regard to rest, feed, and water after the trip from the farm to the sale point. Some hogs arrive empty, some hogs arrive partially empty, and others arrive in filled condition. The degree of fill has a direct bearing on sale appearance, grade, and quality.

I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of the petition, together with the names and addresses of the signers printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The remainder of the petition, together with the names of the signers and their addresses, is as follows:

If the ceiling price was to be fixed it would be necessary to standardize fill condition of live hogs when offered for sale throughout all swine producing areas of the country unless all factors affecting sale value of live hogs are fixed, supervised and controlled by trained hog men, the purpose for which live-hog ceilings are established would be defeated. There are not enough hog men in the country trained in standardizing and grading to perform the marketing services necessary to make the live-hog ceiling plan successful and unless the plan is carried out successfully, hog producers of the country are left in a position of being unprotected in matters of hog marketing.

Dockage for staginess, for excessive weight due to pregnancy, excessive weight due to milk bellies, etc., are also factors which producers are not willing to have determined by the buyer who purchases the hog.

The establishment of ceiling prices on live hogs will tend to eliminate competition for hogs which represents the producer's protection against the influence of variable sale factors.

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 96

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 19 (legislative day, MARCH 9), 1943

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That for expenses necessary for the recruiting, training, and
4 placement of workers needed for the production and harvest-
5 ing of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution
6 of the war (including agricultural workers who are imported
7 into the United States from foreign countries and aliens in-
8 terned in the United States); to be expended under the
9 supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension
10 Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in
11 cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the

1 land-grant colleges in the respective States on the basis
2 of existing cooperative agreements between the Depart-
3 ment and the land-grant colleges as to the conduct of
4 extension work and apportioned to the States on the basis
5 of need for the purposes specified herein; for transporta-
6 tion and subsistence of workers and expenditures for con-
7 struction, rental, or operation of temporary suitable hous-
8 ing or shelter facilities for such workers where existing hous-
9 ing facilities are not adequate (including for the purposes
10 specified herein, agricultural workers who are imported
11 into the United States from foreign countries and aliens
12 interned in the United States), to be expended under the
13 direction and supervision of the Agricultural Extension
14 Service in cooperation with the extension services of the
15 land-grant colleges in the respective States, as hereinbe-
16 fore specified, there is hereby appropriated, out of any
17 money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the
18 sum of $26,100,000, to remain available until December
19 31, 1943, of which not less than $100,000 shall be avail-
20 able for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of
21 Extension, and not less than $13,500,000 shall be appor-
22 tioned to the extension services in the States on the basis
23 of need to enable them to carry out their responsibilities
24 hereunder within the States, including the recruiting, train-
25 ing, and placement of farm labor, the provision, operation,

1 and supervision of temporary housing and shelter facilities
2 and the transportation, supervision, temporary subsistence,
3 and protection of workers within the States as herein pro-
4 vided; the remaining funds not to exceed $12,500,000 to
5 be available as provided herein to carry out cooperative
6 agreements with the United States Employment Service for
7 recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to
8 State, and imported workers, including the payment of nec-
9 essary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and
10 protection of such workers while en route, and including
11 also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned
12 temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm
13 Security Administration for the importation of workers from
14 Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the
15 existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and
16 of the United States with respect to the importation of
17 agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico
18 can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this Act,
19 but not to exceed a period of thirty days after the enact-
20 ment of this Act: *Provided,* That the Office of Extension
21 Service in the United States Department of Agriculture in
22 cooperation with the State extension services in the States
23 which are concerned in obtaining such labor are authorized
24 to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States
25 Employment Service to recruit and transport such domestic

1 and imported labor to and from the respective States and
2 the extension services in the States either individually or
3 collectively may enter into such agreements with the United
4 States Employment Service to recruit and transport such
5 labor, subject to general rules and regulations to be issued
6 by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the
7 United States Employment Services: *Provided further,*
8 That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be ex-
9 pended for the transportation of any worker from the
10 county where he resides or is working to a place of employ-
11 ment outside of such county without the prior consent in
12 writing of the county extension agent of such county, or for
13 the transportation of any worker outside the limits of the
14 State where he resides or is working without the prior con-
15 sent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture for such
16 State or other official who performs similar functions for such
17 State: *Provided further,* That the extension services of the
18 land-grant colleges shall be responsible for the recruiting,
19 training, transportation, and placement of all such workers
20 within their respective States; and the Extension Service is
21 authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated
22 services and to cooperate with any other public or private
23 agency: *Provided further,* That existing farm labor camps and
24 other necessary housing or shelter facilities now owned or

1 hereafter acquired by the United States Department of Agri-
2 culture and former Civilian Conservation Corps camps where
3 suitably located shall be made available to such workers to the
4 extent they are required and shall be operated under the
5 supervision of the Extension Service as hereinbefore pro-
6 vided so long as such facilities are required for this purpose:
7 *Provided further,* That expenditures may be made here-
8 under without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes:
9 *Provided further,* That any payments made by the United
10 States or private employers to aliens brought in under this
11 program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding
12 under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code:
13 *Provided further,* That no part of the funds herein appro-
14 priated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made
15 available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment,
16 transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used
17 directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum
18 wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or
19 to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or
20 union membership with respect to any agricultural labor
21 exempted under the provisions of section 3 (f), 7 (c), and
22 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938,
23 or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of
24 the National Labor Relations Act: *Provided further,* That

1 the terms "States" or "State" as used herein include Puerto
2 Rico and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

Passed the House of Representatives March 17, 1943.

Attest: SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk.

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 96

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

MARCH 19 (legislative day, MARCH 9), 1943

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

April 6, 1943

78th CONGRESS
1st Session

H. J. RES. 96

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

March 19 (legislative day, March 9), 1943

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

[Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic]

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

~~That for expenses necessary for the recruiting, training, and placement of workers needed for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war (including agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States); to be expended under the supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the~~

~~land-grant colleges in the respective States on the basis of existing cooperative agreements between the Department and the land-grant colleges as to the conduct of extension work and apportioned to the States on the basis of need for the purposes specified herein; for transportation and subsistence of workers and expenditures for construction, rental, or operation of temporary suitable housing or shelter facilities for such workers where existing housing facilities are not adequate (including for the purposes specified herein, agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States), to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Agricultural Extension Service in cooperation with the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States, as hereinbefore specified, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $26,100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943, of which not less than $100,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of Extension, and not less than $13,500,000 shall be apportioned to the extension services in the States on the basis of need to enable them to carry out their responsibilities hereunder within the States, including the recruiting, training, and placement of farm labor, the provision, operation,~~

~~and supervision of temporary housing and shelter facilities and the transportation, supervision, temporary subsistence, and protection of workers within the States as herein provided: the remaining funds not to exceed $12,500,000 to be available as provided herein to carry out cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service for recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to State, and imported workers, including the payment of necessary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and protection of such workers while en route, and including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for the importation of workers from Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this Act, but not to exceed a period of thirty days after the enactment of this Act: *Provided,* That the Office of Extension Service in the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the State extension services in the States which are concerned in obtaining such labor are authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such domestic~~

~~and imported labor to and from the respective States and the extension services in the States either individually or collectively may enter into such agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such labor, subject to general rules and regulations to be issued by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the United States Employment Services: *Provided further,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, or for the transportation of any worker outside the limits of the State where he resides or is working without the prior consent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture for such State or other official who performs similar functions for such State: *Provided further,* That the extension services of the land-grant colleges shall be responsible for the recruiting, training, transportation, and placement of all such workers within their respective States; and the Extension Service is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services and to cooperate with any other public or private agency: *Provided further,* That existing farm labor camps and other necessary housing or shelter facilities now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States Department of Agri-~~

1 ~~culture and former Civilian Conservation Corps camps where~~
2 ~~suitably located shall be made available to such workers to the~~
3 ~~extent they are required and shall be operated under the~~
4 ~~supervision of the Extension Service as hereinbefore pro-~~
5 ~~vided so long as such facilities are required for this purpose:~~
6 ~~*Provided further,* That expenditures may be made here-~~
7 ~~under without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes:~~
8 ~~*Provided further,* That any payments made by the United~~
9 ~~States or private employers to aliens brought in under this~~
10 ~~program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding~~
11 ~~under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code:~~
12 ~~*Provided further,* That no part of the funds herein appro-~~
13 ~~priated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made~~
14 ~~available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment,~~
15 ~~transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used~~
16 ~~directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum~~
17 ~~wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or~~
18 ~~to impose or enforce collective bargaining requirements or~~
19 ~~union membership with respect to any agricultural labor~~
20 ~~exempted under the provisions of section 3 (f), 7 (c), and~~
21 ~~13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938,~~
22 ~~or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of~~
23 ~~the National Labor Relations Act: *Provided further,* That~~
24 ~~the terms "States" or "State" as used herein include Puerto~~
25 ~~Rico and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.~~

1 *That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money*
2 *in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of*
3 *$40,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943,*
4 *to be expended under the direction and supervision of the*
5 *Administrator of Food Production and Distribution (here-*
6 *inafter referred to as the "Administrator"), appointed pur-*
7 *suant to Executive Order Numbered 9322, dated March 26,*
8 *1943, for assisting in providing an adequate supply of*
9 *workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural*
10 *commodities essential to the prosecution of the war.*

11 PAYMENTS TO STATES

12 *SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of assisting in providing an*
13 *adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting*
14 *of agricultural commodities within the several States, the*
15 *Administrator shall apportion among the several States, on*
16 *the basis of need, not less than $13,500,000 and not more*
17 *than $20,000000 of the sum appropriated by section 1 and*
18 *the sums so apportioned shall be available for payment to*
19 *such States for expenditure by the agricultural extension*
20 *services in such States, the administration of which*
21 *funds shall be subject to the supervision and approval of*
22 *the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may*
23 *be expended by such extension services shall include, among*
24 *other things, (1) the recruiting, placement (including the*

1 *placement of workers as tenants or sharecroppers), and*
2 *training of such workers; (2) transportation, supervision,*
3 *subsistence, protection, health and medical and burial services,*
4 *and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary*
5 *personal property; (3) lease, repair, alteration, and opera-*
6 *tion of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and*
7 *services, including former Civilian Conservation Corps*
8 *camps; (4) advancing to workers of sums due from em-*
9 *ployers within the United States who are under contractual*
10 *obligation to reimburse such extension services for such ad-*
11 *vances; (5) employment of personnel and other adminis-*
12 *trative expenses; and (6) payment to or reimbursement of*
13 *other public or private agencies or individuals for furnishing*
14 *services or facilities for such purposes. Such extension*
15 *services may enter into agreements with other public and*
16 *private agencies and individuals and utilize the facilities and*
17 *services of such agencies and individuals in carrying out*
18 *the purposes of this section.*

19 *(b) The Administrator shall certify to the Secretary of*
20 *the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts to be paid to*
21 *each State under this section and the time or times such*
22 *amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury*
23 *shall pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the*
24 *Administrator, the amounts so certified.*

1 *EXPENDITURE OF OTHER FUNDS*

2 *SEC. 3. (a) Not more than $20,000,000 of the funds*
3 *appropriated by section 1 and not apportioned by the Ad-*
4 *ministrator among the several States pursuant to section 2*
5 *shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator. The*
6 *purposes for which such funds may be expended shall include,*
7 *among other things, (1) the recruiting, placement (including*
8 *the placement of workers as tenants or sharecroppers), and*
9 *transportation of workers and their families and necessary*
10 *personal property, within the United States and elsewhere;*
11 *(2) furnishing, by loans, grants, or otherwise, of health and*
12 *medical and burial services, training, subsistence, allowances,*
13 *protection, and shelter for such workers and their families;*
14 *(3) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within*
15 *the United States who are under contractual obligation to*
16 *reimburse the United States for such advances; (4) lease,*
17 *repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and*
18 *other necessary facilities and services; and (5) operating*
19 *personnel and expenses to carry out the above purposes.*
20 *Sums collected by way of reimbursement for advances made*
21 *under the authority of this subsection shall be deposited to this*
22 *appropriation, or to appropriations for similar purposes*
23 *available when reimbursement is received, and such deposits*
24 *shall be available for the purposes of the appropriation.*

25 *(b) Not more than 2 per centum of the funds appro-*

1 *priated by section 1 hereof shall be available for admini-*
2 *trative expenses of the Administrator, including (1) the em-*
3 *ployment of persons and organizations, by contract or other-*
4 *wise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (2) purchase,*
5 *exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying*
6 *vehicles; (3) printing and binding; (4) travel expenses of*
7 *persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facili-*
8 *tating capacities within a foreign country or from a foreign*
9 *country to the United States and return, including such*
10 *expenses to first-duty stations; and (5) payment to or reim-*
11 *bursement of other agencies or individuals for administrative*
12 *expenses incurred by them.*

13 *(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution, the Ad-*
14 *ministrator is authorized—*

15 *(1) to utilize the facilities, services, and personnel*
16 *of units and agencies within the Department of Agricul-*
17 *ture; to enter into agreements with other public or pri-*
18 *vate agencies or individuals; to utilize (pursuant to such*
19 *agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies*
20 *and individuals and to delegate to them functions under*
21 *this joint resolution; and to allocate or transfer funds to*
22 *(in addition to the transfers authorized by the Depart-*
23 *ment of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal*
24 *years 1943 and 1944), or otherwise to pay or reimburse*

such units, agencies, and individuals for expenses in connection therewith;

(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

(3) to cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign governments relating to the importation of workers into the United States.

LIMITATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, if such worker has resided in such county for a period of one year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period: Provided, That upon the refusal of the county extension agent to give his consent in any such case, any interested or affected person may appeal to the Administrator, and the Administrator may permit the expenditure of such funds for the transportation of such worker from such county if the Administrator finds that the services of such worker can be more effectively utilized at another place of employment.

(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or here-

tofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country: Provided, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be expended without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) Any payments made by the United States or other public or private agencies or employers to aliens brought into the United States under this joint resolution shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. Aliens brought into the

1 *United States under this joint resolution shall be exempt*
2 *from the payment of the head tax required by section 2*
3 *of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other*
4 *admission charges.*

5 *(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution—*

6 *(1) the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and*
7 *Puerto Rico;*

8 *(2) the term "worker" includes nationals of the*
9 *United States and aliens;*

10 *(3) the term "agricultural labor" includes any*
11 *services or activities included within the provisions of*
12 *section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938*
13 *or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code.*

14 *(d) Effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3*
15 *of the Act of June 29, 1936 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 433),*
16 *receipts derived for the account of the United States from*
17 *the use and occupancy of agricultural labor supply centers,*
18 *including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under*
19 *the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be*
20 *deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.*

21 *(e) The former Civilian Conservation Corps camps*
22 *shall be transferred without charge to the Administrator, to*
23 *the extent that he deems necessary to carry out the purposes*
24 *of this joint resolution: Provided, That no such camp which*
25 *is being utilized by any other agency of the Government, or*

which has been transferred to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization, shall be transferred to the Administrator under this subsection without the consent of such agency, State, county, municipality, or organization.

(f) For the purposes of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and appropriations heretofore or hereafter made to carry out the purposes of such title, no person shall be deemed not to be a needy individual by reason of remuneration paid to such person for any agricultural labor performed by him during the period beginning with the date of enactment of this joint resolution and ending six months after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President. The Federal Security Administrator shall promptly notify each State that grants under such title will be available for the payment of old-age assistance with respect to any person without regard to the remuneration received by such person for agricultural labor performed by him during such period; and no State shall be required, in determining need in the case of any individual, to take into consideration any income or resources derived by him from such agricultural labor.

Passed the House of Representatives March 17, 1943.

Attest: SOUTH TRIMBLE,

Clerk.

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

April 6, 1943

78th Congress
1st Session

H. J. RES. 96

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

March 19 (legislative day, March 9), 1943
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

FURLOUGH OF SERVICEMEN TO AID IN AGRICULTURE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS
UNITED STATES SENATE

SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 680

A BILL TO PROVIDE NEEDED MANPOWER FOR THE PRODUCTION, CONSERVATION, AND PROTECTION OF FOOD DURING THE YEAR 1943

MARCH 19, 1943

Printed for the use of the Committee on Military Affairs

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1943

84396

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, North Carolina, *Chairman*

ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah
EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Colorado
LISTER HILL, Alabama
SHERIDAN DOWNEY, California
ALBERT B. CHANDLER, Kentucky
HARRY S. TRUMAN, Missouri
MON C. WALLGREN, Washington
HARLEY M. KILGORE, West Virginia
JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming

WARREN R. AUSTIN, Vermont
STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire
CHAN GURNEY, South Dakota
RUFUS C. HOLMAN, Oregon
HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., Massachusett
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, West Virginia
GEORGE A. WILSON, Iowa

WESLEY E. MCDONALD, *Clerk*
WALTER I. SMALLEY, *Special Assistant*

FURLOUGH OF SERVICEMEN TO AID IN AGRICULTURE

FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 1943

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met pursuant to call at 2 p. m., in the committee room of the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Capitol, Senator Robert R. Reynolds (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Reynolds (chairman), Johnson, O'Mahoney, Austin, Gurney, Lodge, and Revercomb.

The CHAIRMAN. We have for consideration, gentlemen, S. 680.

Senator Bushfield is the author of this bill, a bill to provide needed manpower for the production, conservation and protection of food during the year 1943.

(S. 680 is as follows:)

[S. 680, 78th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To provide needed manpower for the production, conservation, and protection of food during the year 1943

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That to meet the existing necessity for labor in promoting, protecting, and conserving the production of food during the year 1943, the Secretary of War, with the advice and cooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture, shall upon the request of the Governor of any of the several States within the food-producing area of the United States in which the necessity therefor is certified by such governor grant furloughs to a sufficient number of men in the armed services within the territorial limits of the continental United States to meet such labor requirements.

SEC. 2. Such furloughs shall be granted to men in the armed services for periods of from one to six months at the discretion of the Secretary of War. Such furloughs may be granted either to individuals or to groups of men under military supervision for the purpose of tending, caring for, and providing for livestock on the farms and ranches in the States from which such requests are submitted, and for the further purpose of planting, tending, harvesting, and marketing the food crops of such States during the present year.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, Senator, in your own way, if you will, please.

STATEMENT OF HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Senator BUSHFIELD. Mr. Chairman and Senators, on the 8th day of February I introduced S. 680 in the Senate. It was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. On March 10 the War Department made its report to you stating its opposition to the enactment of this bill. You were kind enough to notify me of this adverse re-

port, with the suggestion that if I had anything to submit the committee would be glad to hear me. I appreciate the courtesy of the committee in giving me this opportunity, because I do have something to submit before this bill is finally acted upon by your committee.

In order that there be no misunderstanding of what I have to say, I have reduced my statement to writing which, with your permission, I propose to read to you at this time.

S. 680 puts its finger upon the thing of which we are all talking—the shortage of manpower upon the farms of this country. It provides that the Secretary of War, with the advice and cooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture, shall upon the request of the Governor of any of the several States grant furloughs to a sufficient number of men in the armed services to meet farm labor requirements. This bill only applies to the year 1943. Planting is already in progress in the Southern States. In another week it will be in progress as far north as South Dakota and southern Minnesota. In 30 days, the crop, or most of it, will be in the ground—the crop that is going to be planted. Unless it is planted, all the furloughs and all the excess manpower in the world will be futile, and I am sure this committee recognizes the critical situation in which we are at the present time. That is why I am here urging immediate consideration of this bill, because it is a question of hours and days—not weeks.

As Governor of my State, South Dakota, I began early in the year 1942 to attempt to sell the Selective Service organization in Washington with the idea that farm manpower must be considered in drafting our new Army. General Hershey and I had a considerable amount of correspondence about this matter. For some reason or other, the Army men did not seem to be impressed with the necessity of a long-range view of our farm labor situation. While the Selective Service Act itself provides for deferment of essential farm labor, draft boards, generally, paid little or no attention to that regulation, and it is easy to understand why. In most of our communities the population is essentially agricultural. Small town life is close to the farm. Draft boards could see no reason for exempting a farm boy and taking a town boy, and excepting cases of necessity they were right. But we are facing an emergency today. As a result of that view the farms of the grain-producing States were drained of their manpower. It was long months before any action was taken to defer manpower. Food in America has always been plentiful, and it seems difficult to impress upon the minds of those in authority that that condition may be changed very quickly.

It was not until late in 1942 that I succeeded in getting a specific order from General Hershey's office deferring farm labor. This order was sent out. I required the director of selective service in my own State to notify in writing every draft board in the State. From that time on, deferments were made, but it was too late—most of the men were gone.

When I came to Washington I renewed my insistence to the Agricultural Department, as well as to the War Department, that we give some consideration to the question of food production. As late as February 2, Secretary Wickard stated, according to the local press, that there would be no reduction in agricultural production, or at least not more than 2 or 3 percent.

Surveys made by my office indicated weeks ago that there was going to be a serious shortage in food production. The Weekly Digest of Food Distribution, published by the American Institute of Food Production, in its issue of February 20, made this significant statement:

> It is reasonable to assume that per capita crop production in 1943 will be 20 percent less than in 1942.
>
> No one can authoritatively predict the weather, but there is little possibility of repeating the bumper crops of 1942, with odds at least 6 to 1 that this will be a season of less than normal average farm production.

The February 9 report of the Department of Agriculture says that cabbage tonnage is likely to be 32 percent less than last season, cantaloup acreage 41 percent, fresh pea tonnage off, potato acreage in north Florida and lower Texas valley off 20 percent, early strawberry acreage off 25 percent, and south Florida tomato tonnage off 12 percent.

> What may happen to crops during January or February is no indication of what weather will do to farm production during the long season between April and October, when about 90 percent of our annual food supplies must be developed, matured, and harvested under conditions fixed by proper mixtures of sunshine and moisture.
>
> For 12 years we have been hearing about our great surpluses of farm products. The only real surpluses of importance have been wheat and a few staples, which we formerly exported. Each year we have consumed more foods than we produced, keeping our food supplies in balance with the imports that have been largely cut off.
>
> In February 1943 we are facing shortages of most foods, after a year of record farm production, because we have become the food supply center for the United Nations.

That, Mr. Chairman, is a rather significant statement. I doubt if the American people themeslves realize that we have been an importing Nation of food products as well as a producing Nation.

Since that time questionnaires sent to county agents through the United States have confirmed these predictions. The proof I think is conclusive that there will be a reduction of at least 20 percent over last year, and that is based upon favorable weather conditions which may not ensue.

Already, Mr. Chairman, the State of Texas is in the grip of an outstanding drought, and it is extending north into Kansas and Oklahoma.

Just as important as weather conditions is the amount of acreage that will be planted in crops. Restrictions by the Department of Agriculture, fear of lack of manpower, inability to get necessary machinery and repairs, uncertainty as to prices, all contribute to a reduction in acreage, and in my State alone, according to letters received from county agents and others close to the farm situation, there will be a reduction of several hundred thousands of acres in the amount of cropland put in.

Now, I read in the Washington Post under date of March 9 that the Secretary of Agriculture says he has a feeling of futility. After reading and listening to his contradictory statements during the last few weeks I quite agree with him.

I offered S. 680 for the purpose of helping out a confused situation so full of uncertainty that we are facing disaster. If feasible at all action should be taken upon this bill now without a day's delay.

I realize that the War Department has reported adversely upon this bill, but I feel reasonably certain that the War Department is so immersed in its tremendous and important job of preparing an army, it has overlooked the facts in connection with the food back of that army. This report says:

It is the policy of the War Department to make available the assistance of troops in the harvesting of essential crops.

This is corroborated by Lt. Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, testifying before the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on February 23, when he stated:

The Army is perfectly willing to do everything it can to assist in food production. We submitted to the President several months ago a plan by which the Army would assist in food production. The memorandum was written to the President on November 28, 1942. We had been considering it for some time before that.

At that hearing I inquired of General McNarney:

In regard to planting the crop, have you considered that angle?

General McNarney. We considered that, and thought that in most instances they could go ahead without the assistance of the Army. However, if there is a real emergency, I am sure the Army would be just as glad to consider assisting in planting the crops as they would be in harvesting (record, 541).

Senator Millikin asked this question:

General, may I ask, did I understand your testimony to be to this effect: That except as to those units that you are readying to send abroad, the rest of the Army will be available for planting, cultivating, or harvesting, if you are convinced of the necessity of it?

General McNarney. Well, I would not go as far as to say "the rest of the Army," but there will be certain units in the Army that will be made available where a critical emergency is shown.

Senator Millikin. Can you put some dimensions on that, so we can estimate how many will be available?

General McNarney. The number to be made available will be based upon the requirements of the situation (record, 546).

Senator Aiken. Who will decide whether the situation is critical or not?

General McNarney. We require assurance from the Secretary of Agriculture that there is a critical emergency. We act upon his recommendation. Normally the procedure for that would be for the farm agent to take it up with the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture would certify to us that the emergency exists. We do the rest (record, 548).

General McNarney. The plan——

the plan above referred to——

has been approved by the President. He approved it yesterday at our request. We have been trying to get it for the last week. We have been pressing for his approval (record, 549).

General McNarney. There is now in process—I gave a directive just before I left the office this morning to put the plan into effect immediately in a certain locality (record, 553).

Senator Millikin. Where will these first experimental units operate General?

General McNarney. War necessity requires the use of troops in Arizona cotton harvest. The War Department announced today that troop units have been assigned to relieve emergency situations arising from the shortage of farm labor for the harvest of the long staple cotton crop in the area near Phoenix, Ariz. (record, 558).

That very day the Associated Press dispatches of the Nation carried the information to the American public that soldiers from camps in the Southwest were being used to harvest the cotton crop of Arizona.

A few days later, Mr. Abbott, representing the cotton growers of the State of Arizona, came before our committee. I asked him whether any soldiers had come into his State to assist in the harvest of their cotton crop. He said there had been none. The same day a Washington newspaper carried the news item that the order of the War Department directing soldiers to take part in the cotton harvest of Arizona had been called by Paul V. McNutt, Commissioner of Manpower, and that the soldiers had not gone to the harvest.

In this connection, a letter from the Coolidge-Florence Farm Bureau, of Coolidge, Ariz., to the congressional delegation from that State in Congress and in particular to Ernest W. McFarland, is of interest—I quote.

Our difficulties in obtaining farm help during the past season have been doubly discouraging. A considerable shortage existed during the production season, but this paled to insignificance when the time came for harvest. During the earlier months we had lost portions of our feed and seed crops for want of the necessary labor for gathering them. At the insistence of Federal agencies, our farmers rather reluctantly changed their 1942 crop planning and greatly increased their acreage of American-Egyptian cotton. With the appeal for additional planting came the implication that the Government would see to it that help would be available at picking time.

It's an old story now—familiar to all of you—how this organization and others, as well as many individuals, endeavored to impress the various Government agencies of the coming need and tried to secure their cooperation. For a few weeks some progress to this end seemed to be under way; and then came the second phase of discouragement. We found that we not only faced the unavoidable difficulties in the labor situation, but were face to face with an antagonism by some of these very agencies which we had counted on for help—we were stalemated and, in effect, obliged to fight an agency of our own Government. The efforts of the Farm Security Administration to force the hourly wage clause upon us during the 1942 picking season has passed into history. But the determination of the farmers against that sort of domination is not history. It is still very much present and alive.

Because not much has been said about that fiasco during recent weeks, please do not be deceived into thinking that everything worked out all right and the crops were taken care of anyway. Hundreds of acres of unpicked cotton were pastured off, some plowed under, and in many large fields the cotton still hangs untouched by pickers, with the crop stringing to the ground, much gone to the ground, and what remains to be picked will be of a quality so poor as to little more than return the actual picking cost. And all this after months and months of effort to get the reformers and visionaries to be practical and forget their theoretical programs for socialization and New Deal experimentation. Whatever—whoever—may have been the 'nigger' in that woodpile, it all resulted in disappointment and loss to many of us farmers and the fact is self evident that hundreds of bales of otherwise valuable long staple cotton will never be available for flying harness, parachutes, or gliders.

I want to read some of Mr. Abbott's testimony in connection with the cotton crop in his State.

Mr. H. S. Abbott, of Phoenix, Ariz., president of the Irrigated Cotton Growers, an organization representing California, Arizona, New Mexico, and west Texas, testified as follows:

A year ago about this time Government officials of the Department of Agriculture came to Arizona and requested that we plant as much long staple cotton of SXP and Pima varieties as we possibly could. They promised us every assistance.

This quotation will be found at page 883 of the record.

In accordance with that request the cotton workers of that area increased their acreage by 60 percent. They made a survey and determined they wanted 29,000 men to pick the crop. Urgent demands upon the Department of Agriculture for assistance were made. The Farm Security Administration showed up on

the scene and brought with them a contract. The contract called for 30 cents an hour guaranty for 75 percent of the time for cotton growers. It contained a bargaining clause. It also contained a bond and required a $5 deposit for each employee (record, 884).

Continuing to quote from the record, pages 885 and 886:

Mr. ABBOTT. No; it was not returnable. To go along with the story, the gentleman who negotiated it, Mr. Ed Rowe, and another man out of San Francisco, who represented the district director of Farm Security, insisted that we form a corporation. He said the Government would not do business with farmers direct, that we had to organize this corporation. We organized the corporation, which is known as the Arizona Cotton Growers Cooperative Association. I became president of it.

We had no sooner organized than I found the farmers in my immediate neighborhood were being approached and asked to come in to the Farm Security Administration and sign up independent contracts, the idea being that they could see that opposition was going to develop because of this contract, and they wanted to break it down.

Continuing to read from Mr. Abbott's testimony, pages 887 and 888 of the record—but before continuing, I wish to say this parenthetically, Mr. Chairman. I do not need to explain to you, Mr. Chairman, about the wages for cotton picking, but to some of us northern Senators perhaps it might be interesting to know that the payment for cotton picking in the Southern States is all done by the pound. Am I not right about that?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Instead of by the hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Continuing to read from Mr. Abbott's testimony:

Mr. ABBOTT. I read the compromise, which was simply an interpretation of this 30 cents an hour for cotton pickers, guaranteed. We turned it down. When they saw they couldn't get any place, they sent on from Washington Mr. Webster and Mr. Watts, of the Department—Mr. Watts is not of the Department, he is of the Forestry Bureau—I don't know what he knows about cotton. They sent down Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Huxley, of the War Manpower Commission, and we attempted to renegotiate the contract. We got everything out of the contract except the 30-cents-an-hour guaranty, which they insisted was the policy instituted by the administration in Washington, and which could not be changed.

The CHAIRMAN. In that 30 cents an hour did they specify how much cotton would be picked in an hour?

That was Mr. Smith.

Mr. ABBOTT. They did not, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STEWART. What had you been in the habit of paying?

Mr. ABBOTT. We paid them by the pound.

Senator STEWART. What was the rate?

Mr. ABBOTT. We were paying at that time $1.50 per hundredweight for short staple cotton and $3 for long staple cotton.

Then, at pages 890–892:

Mr. CHANDLER. Those people needed 21,000 workers and we were only able to get 415. A large percentage of their crop is still in the field ruined or lost. They have lost up to date 10,000 bales of long staple. There have been no soldiers in Arizona except 600 soldiers guarding 200 Japs.

Mr. ABBOTT. Secretary Wickard sent a wire out—it came to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—in which he said that he had secured permission or consent to raise the price of long staple cotton 3 cents, to enable the growers to pay the long staple pickers 4 cents.

The effect of that was this: Long staple cotton picking went to 4 cents; short staple cotton picking went to 2 cents. The general run of labor—we have to irrigate, hand tool our water down between the checks, down the furrows—

the general effect of that on labor was that it went up a dollar a day, with approximately 14,000 laborers.

All in all, that one move on the part of the Secretary has cost the State of Arizona, the farmers, somewhere between seven and ten million dollars, and it did not bring into the State one more cotton picker.

Not only that, but the failure to give us a decent contract at that time, a contract which was acceptable to us, caused the loss of 10,000 bales to the war effort, and if Rommel had not been chased out of Egypt, if he had gone the other way, there would have been a lot of boys coming out of the air today jumping, rather than with parachutes.

Continuing to read from Mr. Abbott's testimony, pages 894–897:

Mr. ABBOTT. The farmers themselves took trucks and went into Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Missouri, and brought in somewhere between ten and twelve thousand laborers. We had pools of labor which we knew. Just as soon as the crops were picked out in those areas, they would not move. They were stationary. We had planned with the United States Employment Service to secure those men, but the Farm Security Administration advertised this contract in all of those areas and stymied and sabotaged the entire movement of labor by United States Employment Service and by ourselves, until we got the United States Employment Service boys over from Texas and asked them the question: "If you had to put a 30-cent-an-hour guaranty into the cotton business in Texas, what would it do?" "Why," they said, "it would ruin the business entirely. It would ruin our business." We told them: "Well, you furnish us the pickers, and we will fight this through." And we did.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator, will you pardon me for a moment. Go right ahead with your statement. I will read it in the record. I have been called to the floor on a nomination pertaining to General Arnold being made a full general. Your statement is extremely interesting. I will be back in just a minute. I will read the part I miss in the record. You go right ahead.

Senator BUSHFIELD. All right.

(Continuing to read from the record:)

Senator STEWART. Did you ever find out who was responsible for the 30 cents an hour?

Mr. ABBOTT. No, sir. And after this loss has occurred, facing the issue as it exists today—this tremendous loss which has accrued in Arizona, and particularly the loss of this cotton to the war effort—I believe that the man who is responsible for that, if he is in Government employ, should be fired or impeached. And that goes from high to low, and from low to high.

Mr. Abbott stated in answer to questions, that he did not know how much the acreage of planting would be this year; that up to date they had not planted more than 10 percent of their acreage; that Senator McFarland has a ranch down there upon which his tenant borrowed $11,000 from the Government to farm that; the tenant got disgusted because of the failure of the Department to furnish labor, sold the crop for pasture for $400 or $500, put the money in his pocket, and walked away.

Mr. Abbott further testified that March 15 is the latest date in his State for planting long staple cotton, and his people do not know now where they are. There will not be more than 60 percent of last year's crop put in because of this condition existing. The Farm Security altogether brought into that area about 1,900 workers instead of the 21,000 needed.

Mr. Abbott testifying about the type of labor furnished them stated—and this will be found at pages 898–899 of the record:

We found a large portion of those workers were unfit for any kind of labor; namely, persons, in the last stages of TB, who were told that Arizona was a

mecca for such diseases and that if they could get out here, they might effect a cure, even if they couldn't work; that they would be given free medical care and attention and otherwise be taken care of. There were active cases of syphilis, confirmed alcoholics, and people choked up with asthma, who by their own admission, had not done a day's work in 2 years; women expecting to become mothers any minute, men over 70 years of age, and jailbirds with long prison records, as well as old worn-out prostitutes. There were some people under age signed on contract. Also, some good people were with this group sent here.

Mr. Abbott, further testified, pages 900–901, that after the crop of last year was largely lost by reason of the failure of the Farm Security to do as agreed and after it is now too late to plant long staple cotton, the agents of that governmental bureau have offered to completely rewrite the contract in accordance with customs prevailing in that area:

Mr. ABBOTT. And, as I say, what I would like to find out is why, if they can do it now, they could not do it 6 months ago.

Senator AUSTIN. Was that in the Committee on Agriculture?

Senator BUSHFIELD. The Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Senator.

Mr. Abbott further testified:

While this was going on, Secretary Wickard sent me an ultimatum—or our group—and he told us: "The Government feels justified in holding Arizona growers responsible for saving the current crop of long staple cotton in that State. There can be no further modification of the grower-worker contracts for the harvesting of this year's long staple cotton crop."

What I want to know is, which is the more important or what is more important: to maintain that policy or to get that crop harvested? And I believe that the request of my people to you gentlemen to find out the reasons for that is very important and is absolutely justified.

Quoting further from Mr. Abbott's testimony:

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that without any Government interference Arizona could have gathered that crop?

Mr. ABBOTT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The farmers themselves could have handled the situation?

Mr. ABBOTT. Yes, sir; because we would have gone into Texas and other places in conjunction with United States Employment Service, and with the work of our county agents in the Extension Serivice, and we would have gotten our men, and they would have picked this crop. But when we asked for that help and this contract came up, it shoved us over on another route, and when this contract was advertised all over by Farm Security, it absolutely sabotaged the entire deal. If the local boys of United States Employment Service had been permitted to work at it without reference from Washington, we would have gotten the job done.

Now, on coming back here I find that they have asked this same group who blocked us last year, asking for sixty-five or seventy million dollars. I guess that is to do the same thing to other people that they are doing to us.

I want to register before this committee a very definite protest on the part of my people and also myself as an American citizen and a farmer against this Congress appropriating $17,000,000 for the construction of camps which are not needed. Every farmer has room for labor, and in only a few instances will it be found necessary to establish small, rolling gathering camps for the harvesting of berries on the east coast or fruits on the west coast.

I also wish to register the very definite opposition of the irrigated cotton growers of the four States that I represent to any appropriation at all to the Farm Security Administration for the handling of labor. They are a socialist organization. They were originally organized to help the underprivileged.

Senator JOHNSON. That testimony is being offered in support of S. 680?

Senator BUSHFIELD. It is, and I will explain why.

Senator JOHNSON. It looks to me like it is pretty much around Robin Hood's barn if it is.

Senator BUSHFIELD. I will explain why, but I had to present this picture to you gentlemen in order to present the final point that I wanted to bring up before this committee.

Senator JOHNSON. There is nothing in that evidence at all showing where your bill would in any way relieve the situation. It isn't charged, any place in that testimony, that the Army could have relieved the situation by furloughs.

Senator BUSHFIELD. The Army could have done so.

Senator JOHNSON. In fact, he says they could have taken care of it themselves if they didn't have this dispute about the 30 cents an hour.

Senator BUSHFIELD. The reason I am presenting this testimony, Senator Johnson, is this: The attempted handling of the farm-labor situation by governmental bureaus has been so bungled they haven't done anything, and when the Army tried to step in and help relieve the situation in the State of Arizona, another governmental agency stepped in and canceled the authority, and I would like to know who has power in this situation to issue orders.

Senator JOHNSON. My point is this: I think there are a great many arguments for Army furloughs, but I can't see where the bungling by departments in Washington has anything to do with it. Let us correct the bungling instead of destroying the Army.

Senator BUSHFIELD. If the Congress says in definite terms what it wants done, the Army will do it.

Senator JOHNSON. That is bringing in a remedy that is not needed, according to their own testimony. They say, "Let us alone; we will take care of it all right."

Senator BUSHFIELD. Secretary Wickard says we are short 3,000,000 men in farm labor.

Senator JOHNSON. That is right. This testimony does not say that.

Senator BUSHFIELD. If you will let me finish, I will be glad to answer any questions you care to ask me.

Further along the same line, I refer you to the testimony of Mr. W. R. Ogg, secretary of the American Farm Bureau Federation:

> The American Farm Bureau Federation and several of the other national farm organizations, the Nation Grange, the National Cooperative Council, representing most of the organized farmers of the country, have repeatedly warned that we were going to have serious food shortage unless the policies of the Office of Price Administration and some of the other Government policies were changed. That shortage and the crisis are already upon us.

What I have just quoted will be found at page 447 of the record.

Mr. Ogg continued to testify as follows, pages 452 and 453:

> We have got a shortage now, and I would like to put into the record at this point a carefully prepared statement submitted to me by the Secretary of the Arizona Farm Bureau, based on studies by the college and other authoritative sources, which shows that the farmers of Arizona have already lost $4,300,000 in profits because of the bungling of the farm labor situation, farm labor recruiting and replacement by the Farm Security Administration, their attempts to promote a social reform program under the guise of the war instead of helping farmers get their labor as their No. 1 problem.

Senator AUSTIN. May I inquire what page of the testimony that is on?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Pages 452, 453.

Senator AUSTIN. Thank you.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Now, turning to another State, Mr. L. L. Chandler, representing the Florida Vegetable Growers, testified before our committee the same day:

Down in south Florida we began seeing what we thought was trouble ahead of us in several regards nearly 2 years ago. Last June we had just ended the season for our spring planting and harvesting, and having run into such difficulties, especially with farm labor, we began an organized effort in those southern counties by asking the various governmental agencies involved to arrange for and help us to secure a sufficient supply of farm labor (p. 458).

We appeared first before the Department of Agriculture to find out whether they wanted us to maintain the same acreage for production in the 1942–43 season that had been normal with us, so we would know what we were talking about. We were told they did; that they would likely want an increase (p. 459).

With the assurances that we had received, we planted the normal early fall crop (p. 461).

Quoting further from Mr. Chandler, at pages 471 and 472:

I have lived very closely with the Farm Security Administration. I find some very estimable gentlemen here in Washington who have the thing in charge, and, who, I think, have done all they can do with the limitations imposed upon them, but somewhere this policy price situation or this policy-fixing lays down a reform, socialistic reform stuff to follow through the Farm Security Administration.

Let me just take your time and, because it is a guinea-pig situation, tell you what happened to a farmer in Dade County. He is told that if he wants labor he must sign a contract, which I guarantee none of you within the sound of my voice as a businessman would sign, because the Government writes into this contract that it will exert its best efforts to procure labor for him. To apply such a measure to the production of crops as Sunday afternoon labor and the borrowing of the Army for a day or two and getting some women and school kids from time to time does not take care of any agricultural production that I know anything about, for the reason that if today, Monday, there is need for some work for an agricultural crop of any kind it must be done today or within 2 or 3 days, or else the damage is done, and you can't come in over there next Sunday afternoon when the women's club has gotten together and decided that it is time to go out and help save that crop, and that you cannot take women and children and put a knapsack sprayer on their backs and put them out in the field with it. You can't take nice, sweet old ladies, if you please, out of the Miami Women's Club and go down and harvest potatoes. It just isn't done. They can't drive a tractor. They don't know how to hitch up and get behind a mule and cultivate up and down the farm rows. They don't know how to put fertilizer on, and I tell you frankly I don't blame them. They don't like to go out and dip their hands into a bucket of compost, with which we plant these crops. Farm labor will do it, and it is strong enough to do it, but the Government must find somewhere, somehow, labor that is willing and anxious to do this work.

Then I asked the question:

That labor was furnished to you or recruited by the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. CHANDLER. That labor was recruited by the United States Employment Service, which has instructions to find anything that could stand in shoe leather sign up on a contract, which he signs, similar to the one the farmer signs, his contract being then with the United States Government, and when he signs that contract from there on he is a pampered, petted individual. The Government feeds him, they sleep him, and walk him down to my quarters or wherever they want and put him in there. And they spend days chasing around to see what type of sleeping facilities, cooking facilities, even including the toilets, are provided for the laborer. I have some houses, a "Negro town," as I call it, of 28 houses on my own farm. I can house 300 people there. I charge them no rent. They have lived in those same houses for years. They are clean, they are painted, they pass the inspection of the State health department, but the Farm Security administrator walked over there and they found one toilet that didn't suit them, and condemned the whole quarters, said nobody could come in this camp. Yet they will go less than a mile away and set up tents and put up much worse facilities and move this labor over there, into their own camp, charge that labor

50 cents a week, and the laborers sit up in the doors of those tents, and when I go over to get them to go to work in the morning, although they are under contract to do the work with me, they thumb their fingers at me and say: "Chandler, we don't want to do this kind of work. We want to pick beans or else we just don't want to work," and they don't work.

That will be found on pages 474 and 475.

Mr. Chandler further testifies, at pages 477 and 478:

I have seen in my own field time and time again the Negroes make up their money in a pot and send it to town for a case of I. W. Harper whisky and drink it in the field and lay around drunk between the bean and tomato rows, and I can't do anything about it.

Now, the loose women of that outfit follow right on out in the field and pick up their men, and it is just a grand orgy, if you please, in which the farmer stands there growing his beans. I walk out and say to the foreman: "Now, look, here is a first picking bean field. That is the best. Here is the next picking, a week or 10 days later. Can you get this crew to pick these beans?" He goes out and says, "Boys, we have got a patch to pick over here." They will appoint a committee of their own, and they walk over the field, and that bean field today remains unpicked, if you please, gentlemen. That field would have picked nearly 100 hampers of beans per acre of the same that was picked from there, and they just wasted.

Then, I asked this question:

You lost the crop?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes, sir; because that is a perishable vegetable crop. They are either cultivated or they are worked or they are harvested when they need to be, or they waste.

Mr. Chandler also testified that Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, was notified that they needed 17,689 laborers in his area, and were promised that they would be taken care of. At the time of the testimony, 2,021 laborers of the type above described had been furnished. This appears at page 479.

Now, the same governmental set-up proposes to take care of the farm-labor situation by recruiting 50,000 hill farmers from the mountain areas of Tennessee and Kentucky, giving them a week's training and turning them loose as farm manpower in the grain-growing States. If the proposal were not so tragic, it would be laughable, but that is not all. The Department now proposes to take school children, give them a few days' training and make farm laborers of them. How many of you Senators who know anything about farming would trust your livestock to farmers of that type, or would trust your power farm machinery to men of that kind and of that training? The farmers of this Nation want to produce food. They do not want to be made guinea pigs for the experiments of idealistic social reformers or incompetent administrators, and the plan I am proposing, to use actual farmers, the kind raised and trained throughout their lives on the farm, will answer the problem. Farming is a skilled trade requiring years to learn, and the social reformers in some Washington bureau cannot be allowed to destroy the production of food for our people.

S. 729 has already passed the Senate. It is important and worth while, but it is too late. There are not over 250,000 men left on the farms who can be deferred. We need 3,000,000. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, testifying before our subcommittee February 18, said:

I doubt if it will reach 300,000. I would feel that if we got 250,000 physically qualified, we would be doing well.

He gave that testimony at page 282.

According to the newspapers of March 5, Colonel Sanders has discovered another marvelous scheme for solving the whole farm-labor problem. Colonel Sanders is going to reorganize the farm life of America. Individual farm units are to be abandoned, and farming is to be done on a county basis. My county in the State of South Dakota contains 48 townships, each of them 6 miles equare. It does not require any imagination to see the picture of farming a farm unit 30 by 48 miles in size. These cockeyed ideas will not solve the problem, and the American people will not stand for that kind of impractical planning. It is time that we got down to the basic facts of the situation without dreaming about them.

Let us take the figures we have before us. The Army has stated that they want a total of 8,200,000 men. Approximately one and a half million soldiers are now overseas. Not more than one million and a half can be taken overseas this summer, according to the most reliable estimate of those who should know. For obvious reasons, I am not quoting names at this time. That will leave not less than 5,000,000 men under arms within the United States.

Senator LODGE. What period of time is that, Governor?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Just during this summer.

Senator LODGE. We won't have 8,000,000 this year.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Not before the end of the year, but we have, according to the testimony before our committee, about 7,000,000 men under arms now.

Senator LODGE. Now?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Yes, sir.

Senator LODGE. In the Army?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Senator LODGE. Seven million men in the Army now?

Senator BUSHFIELD. That is what I understand.

Senator LODGE. I think that is erroneous, Senator. I think that is entirely incorrect. I think it is between four and five, maybe a little over five.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, suppose we put it at 5,000,000 men. You take 2,000,000 away from that, and that leaves 3,000,000 that you will have here in the camps of this country all this summer. They can't go overseas.

Senator LODGE. That includes men training to be fliers?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Yes; it includes all the men.

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Senator BUSHFIELD. They are composed of townsmen, city men, and farmers. There is no possible chance of them going overseas during the present crop season. They are in training camps in every State where crops are grown with the exception of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Wisconsin, Montana, and Michigan. These camps are within 300 miles at the outside of any of these last-named States. Within the States in which the camps are located they are probably not more than 150 miles from any place within those States. A matter of hours of transportation.

During the last war men were sent home by the tens of thousands for from a week to 30 days to help harvest and take care of crops. Every Army officer who has testified before our committee or other

committees of Congress has said that this plan is feasible. Lieutenant General McNarney says that the Army already has a plan for using the manpower of the camps.

If we fail in food production, this committee and this Congress will be held responsible. No one else is to blame. Nothing more terrible could be imagined that American soldiers were defeated or destroyed in a foreign land because we in America failed to supply food to them. I, for one, do not want that responsibility on my soul. It is not an Army problem. Our military leaders have their jobs. They are important, but it is not the production of food or the running of the business here at home. It is a peoples' war and we, their representatives, must run everything in this war except the military end of it. One of the major problems is the care of the civilian population; 120,000,000 people living in this country are just as important as the 8,000,000 in the Army. Army men say that they do not think the suggestion of furloughs is good, because it will break the men in training. Let me say to you in all earnestness that you can't train a hungry man, and certainly furloughs up to 30 days cannot seriously harm a man's training; in fact, Army men have told me that a break in training is a good thing, because the daily hard work of the Army makes them grow stale. This training, according to Lieutenant General McNarney, lasts for a full year, but I assert that not only for the welfare of the men, but for the production of the food for themselves and for us, brief furloughs will do more to solve this problem than all the cockeyed ideas advanced up to date by the Department of Agriculture. Army officials are no more infallible than Members of Congress or any others. As an illustration of that, let me tell you of an incident that occurred just recently.

At a large Army air base, handling about 30,000 soldiers, one of the classes graduated 7 men for whom no orders were received, and no one could tell them what they were to do. The commandant of the air base permitted them to stay in camp and fed them and housed them. These 7 men waited 7 weeks in that camp without word from the War Department as to where they were to go. Then one day the men discovered a notice on the bulletin board of the camp that those particular 7 men were posted from a distant Army camp as deserters.

The War Department and our military leaders recognize the principle of furloughs. It was done successfully in the last war. The soldiers furloughed home at that time helped us save the crop. It can be done in this war. I have pointed to you the available pool of skilled trained farmers, not hillbillies, not school children, not town dwellers, but experienced farm laborers. Instead of leaving this critical situation to be solved by Government agencies who do not seem to know what the answer is and have them floundering around for weeks with fantastic ideas of how to solve this difficult situation, let us use our common sense. Let us use this great pool of farm labor which is available to us and ready at hand for use in a way that will not interfere with the war effort but will protect us and help us in the production of our food supply.

In closing, I want to express my appreciation to this committee for hearing me upon this very important problem. I have taken more of your time than I should have done, but it was necessary for me to cover the ground that I have in order to bring to you the impossibility of leaving the solution to the ineptness of governmental bureaus. Con-

gress must handle this problem itself. It must be plain, in language that the Government agencies will understand and cannot misinterpret. We must lay the law down in exactly the way we want it. As proof of that, I refer again to the tragic spectacle of the Army ordering out soldiers to harvest the cotton crop in Arizona and then have the War Manpower Commission cancel the order. I urge you to give Congress the opportunity to pass this bill, because it offers the only solution of farm manpower than has been presented. Senator Bankhead's S. 730 is very similar to this bill that I am advocating. There is no cry of ownership at all. I am only interested, and intensely so, in the idea that I have presented here. I do hope that this committee will see fit to let the matter come to the floor of the Senate for discussion.

Thank you.

Senator LODGE. Are you willing to answer any questions, Senator?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Certainly; that is what I am here for.

Senator LODGE. First of all, I congratulate you on your industry and perseverance in this matter. I was especially interested in what you told us about the Farm Security Administration. That is just a part of the whole picture of incompetence that we find. I am more impressed with that, frankly, than I am with the fact that seven men in the Army didn't get their orders.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, that was not offered as criticism, you understand.

Senator LODGE. Yes. The Army has grown fast, and the people that put orders out are young fellows, and you must expect there will be some mistakes.

Senator BUSHFIELD. I didn't offer that as a criticism of the Army.

Senator LODGE. I understand.

Now, would you favor this bill regardless of whether or not the Bankhead bill becomes law?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, they are very similar, Senator, in context.

Senator LODGE. If the Bankhead bill is passed would you want to withdraw this?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, let us not be confused.

Senator LODGE. I mean the Johnson substitute.

Senator JOHNSON. That is a different bill and has a different purpose.

Senator LODGE. I am not conversant with that. I mean the bill that passed the Senate.

Senator BUSHFIELD. No; I wouldn't want to withdraw it, because I think either this bill or Senator Bankhead's second bill supplements what we have already done.

Senator LODGE. So that if the bill that passed the Senate last week becomes law and this becomes law, you would be exempting people who are in agriculture now, and you would be pulling out of the Army farmers who are already in the Army?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Only for a week or two, Senator.

Senator LODGE. And then, of course, the demand to exempt a man from the city would become very, very strong, too. I wonder where we would be in the end?

In the bill here, in line 8, you refer to "the several States within the food producing area of the United States." Is that a term of art or does that mean some special area?

Senator BUSHFIELD. No; only those that produce food. Some of them are so negligible that they don't count. The State of Utah, for instance, only has three percent of the land in the whole State that is arable.

Senator LODGE. How many men do you think would be affected by this bill?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, I feel that it is a matter for the commanding officer of any of these camps to handle. I don't know how many men would be affected. I know my State of South Dakota, Senator, has sent over 30,000 men to the service up to date.

Senator LODGE. This says: "Upon the request of the Governor," men shall be furloughed for farm labor. That leaves it up to the Governors in control, doesn't it?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, you understand the terms of the bill are not at all important. It is only the idea, that I am trying to place before the committee, that here is a pool that Congress can make available if it sees fit.

Senator LODGE. You don't insist that the Governor be left in control?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Not at all; no. The mechanics of it are entirely immaterial to me.

Senator LODGE. Of course, I am very much impressed with the importance of growing food and having enough food, but let me tell you, frankly, the difficulty that occurs to me: Take a division, any division in the Army, where you have 12 to 14 thousand men. This is what has been going on in the Army, to my certain knowledge. After it has been constituted for about 4 months, they take 4,000 officers and men out of it and form a new division. They get 4,000 new men. Frequently they do that splitting up process 2 and 3 times, because the Army is growing so fast. Say you are a company commander. You have sergeant so-and-so who is just beginning to learn what to do. You have your tank drivers. You have your artillery men, and your engineers. They are just learning what to do, just beginning to get to know you if they happened to bump into you in the rain at 3 o'clock in the morning. The training of the individual soldier, what he learns about his own personal hygiene and his personal skill is but a small part of it. The big part of it is getting to know the man on his right and the man on his left and what they are supposed to do. That is what Colonel MacArthur called the soldier's faith. If, on top of that, you are going to pull soldiers out for a month at a time to engage in agriculture, if you are going to do that, you are just going to cripple them for quite a long period of time.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, Senator, I am not an Army man, know nothing about the Army, but you are talking largely about armored units now, are you not?

Senator LODGE. No, the infantry divisions, too.

Senator BUSHFIELD. The infantry divisions do not need the same intensive training, do they, as the armored units?

Senator LODGE. You have to have the teamwork there, too.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Every man in the Army is getting a furlough. They allow these boys to come home.

Senator LODGE. They can get furloughs, yes.

Senator BUSHFIELD. This would only be an extension.

Senator LODGE. But the trouble is, if you have it upon the request of the Governor it would not come along at all at the time the Army wanted it.

Senator BUSHFIELD. That provision in there is not of importance, and it was only put in because I thought the Governor of the State might have first-hand knowledge as to the labor needs.

Senator LODGE. As I understand it, the Secretary of War is willing to furlough men at the convenience of the Army.

Senator JOHNSON. By unit, Senator?

Senator LODGE. Yes; so it doesn't disturb the unit; isn't that right?

Senator JOHNSON. Yes; I think so.

Senator LODGE. In that case, if you are not insistent upon this "request of the Governor" in here, why isn't the Secretary of War now willing to do what you desire?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Here is the trouble with it. You bump into the same thing that the Army bumped into with the Manpower Commission. They gave an order and the Manpower Commission canceled the order. I want to know who has the authority.

Senator REVERCOMB. That is what I wanted to ask you. Do I understand that the War Department indicated or stated that they were willing to furlough or release men, either by a union or in some other fashion, and that that was canceled by the Director of the Manpower Commission, Mr. McNutt?

Senator BUSHFIELD. I haven't a copy of the order, but the newspapers in the city of Washington stated, I think it was 5 days after General McNarney's testimony before our committee that he had issued the directive for the soldiers to go to Arizona, that McNutt had overruled the Army and canceled the order.

Senator REVERCOMB. In other words, the Army was willing to release the men, by units or otherwise, and the Manpower Commissioner canceled that?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Senator LODGE. We ought to make very sure of that.

The Secretary of War has stated, in a letter on the desk, that he is willing to furlough them for agricultural work, and if the Manpower Commissioner has overruled the Secretary of War, we ought to obtain definite confirmation of that fact, and I think the chairman of the committee should write a letter, establishing that fact definitely once and for all.

Senator AUSTIN. I was going to bring out that it occurred this way: not that the Manpower Commissioner overruled the Secretary of War—I don't think that is possible—but that the Secretary of War issued the order and that thereupon it was followed by a statement by the War Manpower Commissioner to him that it was not necessary, and that on that statement to him, of facts, it was that he canceled the order himself. I think you will find that that is what happened.

Senator BUSHFIELD. I think the chairman should ascertain the exact facts.

The CHAIRMAN. I will ascertain the true facts and report them to this committee. As a matter of fact, I will call those gentlemen on the telephone, in order that I can report to you more direct about the

matter, and ask that the conversation be confirmed by a letter for the record.

Senator REVERCOMB. What I said was in the form of an inquiry. I don't know, but I gather from the statement of Senator Bushfield that something of that kind had occurred. I think we ought to be advised of it.

Senator BUSHFIELD. The whole thing could be handled through the Secretary of War if his authority stands up and somebody doesn't overrule him.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions, gentlemen?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. I want to thank you, Senator, for your opinions on this matter, and I apologize for having to go out of the chamber on some business on the Senate floor.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. It certainly has been very interesting.

I will ask the reporter to insert in the record the letter from the Secretary of War.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1943.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: The War Department is opposed to the enactment of S. 680, Seventy-eighth Congress, a bill "to provide needed manpower for the production, conservation, and protection of food during the year 1943."

This bill is designed to require the Secretary of War, during the year 1943, with the advice and cooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture, to grant furloughs to members of the armed forces in the continental United States in sufficient numbers to meet the agricultural labor requirements within the food-producing States, upon the request and certificate of necessity therefor of the governors of one or more of such States. The contemplated furloughs would be for periods of 1 to 6 months at the discretion of the Secretary of War, and would be granted either to individuals or to groups of men under military supervision for the purpose of tending livestock and planting, tending, harvesting and marketing the food crops produced by such States.

The purpose of this bill is similar to that of S. 730, Seventy-eighth Congress, concerning which the War Department recently expressed to your committee its strong opposition.

It is the policy of the War Department to make available the assistance of troops in the harvesting of essential crops endangered by farm labor shortages in such a manner as will cause minimum interference with the required intensive training of military organizations. Under this plan military units would be selected from stations in close proximity to the critical areas and would perform their missions under the supervision of their own commanders, returning to their proper stations to resume their prescribed military training and activities as soon as their agricultural work is completed. In this manner, considerable assistance can be rendered to the hard-pressed farming localities where civilian labor is, in fact, not procurable, without unduly retarding the essential preparation of military personnel for combat duty.

The proposed legislation, if enacted, would undoubtedly result in the release of many thousands of men for an extended period. As experience has revealed that continuity of training is imperative to equip our soldiers properly for the field of combat, it is the considered opinion of the War Department that extended furloughs, as contemplated by this measure, would seriously impair that training. Moreover, it is not believed that the difference between the measure of assistance which will be available in critical farming situations under the Army's present policy and that which the proposed legislation would make available could possibly justify the disruptive effects of the legislation upon the country's fighting forces.

Considerable emphasis has already been placed on deferments from service in the military forces for farm laborers. Subsection 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (Sec. 4, Public Law 772, 77th Cong.), provides deferment from training and service for persons found to be necessary to and regularly engaged in agriculture. Men 38 years of age and over who are in the military service and who can produce evidence that they will be employed in agriculture will be discharged from the Army upon their request. Men will not be accepted for enlistment in any component of the Army if they are farm workers. It has been estimated that farm deferments will approximate a total of 3,031,000 by December 1, 1943. The armed services have thus already made such adjustments in their requirements as are reasonably compatible with the effective fighting of the war, in order to conserve agricultural production in this country.

For the foregoing reasons, the War Department strongly opposes the enactment of S. 680.

Inasmuch as the Committee has requested that this report be expedited, the Bureau of the Budget has authorized its submission without a determination by the Bureau as to whether it conforms to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON, *Secretary of War.*

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will now go into executive session.

(Whereupon, at 3 p. m., the committee retired into executive session.)

×

FARM LABOR PROGRAM, 1943

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE

SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H. J. Res. 96

A JOINT RESOLUTION MAKING AN APPROPRIATION TO ASSIST IN PROVIDING A SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 1943

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
84461 WASHINGTON : 1943

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

KENNETH McKELLAR, Tennessee, *Chairman*

CARTER GLASS, Virginia
CARL HAYDEN, Arizona
MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland
RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia
JOHN H. OVERTON, Louisiana
ELMER THOMAS, Oklahoma
PAT McCARRAN, Nevada
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming
JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2D, Alabama

GERALD P. NYE, North Dakota
HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., Massachusetts
RUFUS C. HOLMAN, Oregon
C. WAYLAND BROOKS, Illinois
STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire

EVERARD H. SMITH, *Clerk*

FARM LABOR PROGRAM, 1943

MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1943

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met in the committee room, the Capitol, pursuant to call, at 10:30 a. m., Hon. Richard B. Russell presiding.

Present: Senators Russell, Hayden, Thomas of Oklahoma, Tydings, Overton, Bankhead, Nye, Lodge, Holman, and Brooks.

Senator RUSSELL. The committee will please come to order.

Inasmuch as this measure is legislation as well as carrying an appropriation, I think that the resolution should be printed in the hearings. We will have it printed in the hearings at this juncture.

(H. J. Res. 96, above referred to, is as follows:)

[H. J. Res. 96, 78th Cong., 1st sess.]

JOINT RESOLUTION Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for expenses necessary for the recruiting, training, and placement of workers needed for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war (including agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States); to be expended under the supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States on the basis of existing cooperative agreements between the Department and the land-grant colleges as to the conduct of extension work and apportioned to the States on the basis of need for the purposes specified herein; for transportation and subsistence of workers and expenditures for construction, rental, or operation of temporary suitable housing or shelter facilities for such workers where existing housing facilities are not adequate (including for the purposes specified herein, agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States), to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Agricultural Extension Service in cooperation with the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States, as hereinbefore specified, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $16,100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943, of which not less than $100,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of Extension, and not less than $13,500,000 shall be apportioned to the extension services in the States on the basis of need to enable them to carry out their responsibilities hereunder within the States, including the recruiting, training, and placement of farm labor, the provision, operation, and supervision of temporary housing and shelter facilities and the transportation, supervision, temporary subsistence, and protection of workers within the States as herein provided; the remaining funds not to exceed $12,500,000 to be available as provided herein to carry out

cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service for recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to State, and imported workers, including the payment of necessary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and protection of such workers while en route, and including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for the importation of workers from Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this Act, but not to exceed a period of thirty days after the enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That the Office of Extension Service in the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the State extension services in the States which are concerned in obtaining such labor are authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such domestic and imported labor to and from the respective States and the extension services in the States either individually or collectively may enter into such agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such labor, subject to general rules and regulations to be issued by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the United States Employment Services; *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is workng to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, or for the transportation of any worker outside the limits of the State where he resides or is working without the prior consent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture for such State or other official who performs similar functions for such State; *Provided further*, That the extension services of the land-grant colleges shall be responsible for the recruiting, training, transportation, and placement of all such workers within their respective States; and the Extension Service is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services and to cooperate with any other public or private agency: *Provided further*, That existing farm labor camps and other necessary housing or shelter facilities now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States Department of Agriculture and former Civilian Conservation Corps camps where suitably located shall be made available to such workers to the extent they are required and shall be operated under the supervision of the Extension Service as hereinbefore provided so long as such facilities are required for this purpose: *Provided further*, That expenditures may be made hereunder without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That any payments made by the United States or private employers to aliens brought in under this program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of section 3 (f), 7 (c), and 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act: *Provided further*, That the terms "States" or "State" as used herein include Puerto Rico and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

Passed the House of Representatives March 17, 1943.

Attest:

SOUTH TRIMBLE, *Clerk*.

STATEMENTS OF HON. CLAUDE R. WICKARD, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, ACCOMPANIED BY WAYNE H. DARROW, DIRECTOR, AGRICULTURAL LABOR ADMINISTRATION; M. L. WILSON, DIRECTOR, EXTENSION SERVICE; R. LYLE WEBSTER, ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY; AND R. W. MAYCOCK, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OFFINANCE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, we are glad to have you here this morning and will be glad to have you make any statement you see fit in regard to this legislation.

Secretary WICKARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee. I have prepared a statement which I would like to give to you. Perhaps I can do it more concisely by reading it than I can by giving it to you informally.

AMOUNT OF BUDGET ESTIMATE AND HOUSE ACTION

At the time that our request was formulated the Budget Bureau asked that we present a comprehensive labor program covering the full calendar year 1943. We did so and the Budget Bureau recommended and the President approved an estimate of $65,075,000 which was submitted for the 10-month period beginning March 1 and ending December 31, 1943. As you know this estimate was reduced sharply in the House. The House debate indicated that at least some members felt that the amount approved by the House would not be enough for this year but that the Department should make a start with a small amount and come back for more funds later. This is a matter which is, of course, up to the Congress and I wish only to make the point now that our original estimate was intended to cover this crop year so that neither the people in the Department nor the Members of the Congress would have to again take up this matter at a later time when the administration of the labor program would be calling for our full attention. As it is now March 22 our original estimate would, of course, need to be adjusted to fit the remainder of this year.

ESTIMATE INCLUDED FUNDS FOR EXTENSION SERVICES FOR LOCAL MOBILIZATION OF LABOR

In our original request we indicated that certain funds would be made available for the use of Extension Service to do the job for which they are admirably suited, that is, local mobilization of labor. For the mobilization of labor across interstate and international lines, we indicated that the funds would be made available to the Secretary so that the agencies of the Department and other outside agencies best suited to do that job could be utilized by the Secretary.

ACTION TAKEN BY HOUSE ON BUDGET ESTIMATE

The House, probably because we didn't make sufficiently clear the magnitude of the problem, reduced the estimate to $26,100,000 and instead of giving to the Department the necessary flexible authority to handle the importation and transportation of workers, directed that this authority be divided among the various State extension services, the Federal Extension Service, and the United States Employment Service. Also, the House wrote in a provision prohibiting the fixing of any standards for wages, housing, and other working conditions in connection with this program. The amendment providing that no labor can be transported out of a county or a State unless agreed to by the county agent or the ranking State agricultural official will freeze the normal movement of migratory labor. In my view the provisions of House Joint Resolution 96 call for a method of operation which has been proved to be ineffective and cumbersome because of the division of authority and responsibility. Also in my judgment the prohibition against any wage and housing standards will invalidate the agreements which we have with Mexico and the Bahama Islands for the importation of workers from those countries and will also prevent our entering into agreements with any other areas where foreign labor might be obtained.

ADMINISTRATION OF FARM LABOR PROGRAM

I believe that I have spent more time on the farm labor problem in the last 2 years than I have on any other one subject. I have had experience in working with the United States Employment Service and with the Manpower Commission. I have had experience in trying to obtain workers for farmers without any help in the form of Government transportation, and I have had experience in the field of transporting farm labor. In addition to that I have found out the hard way what will work from an organizational viewpoint and what will not work. Even before I had the direct responsibility for farm labor that I now have, I had some labor work under way in the Department. I have had this labor work in the Department located in a secretarial staff office. When the Food Production Administration was set up I placed labor activities in the F. P. A. I have come finally to the conclusion that the most effective way to handle this labor problem is to establish a small central directing agency in the Department of Agriculture, responsible directly to me, with such agency having full responsibility for integrating and directing all phases of the farm labor program for the whole Department.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AGRICULTURAL LABOR ADMINISTRATION

Based on the hard experience of the last year and a half I set up on March 1, 1943, in the Department the Agricultural Labor Administration and gave to that Administration the responsibilities I have just outlined. This agency has paid good dividends in the few weeks it has been in existence. Since this agency was formed we have broken the log jam on the recruitment of Mexican workers and the

latest word I had was that a load of 600 Mexican workers was to have left Mexico City today for southern California for work in the citrus-fruit area.

AGREEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF BAHAMA ISLANDS

[See p. 211]

In the short time that I have had the responsibility and that the Agricultural Labor Administration has been in existence we have initiated and concluded an agreement with the Government of the Bahama Islands for the importation of workers from that area, and we are preparing to recruit and transport them immediately. We have initiated, and the War Manpower Commission has approved, a program for deferring all farm workers who are contributing a reasonable production to the war effort. The Agricultural Labor Administration has under way a program for placing on farms a great many more conscientious objectors with farm experience than have been so placed up to now.

UTILIZATION OF OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES BY AGRICULTURAL LABOR ADMINISTRATION

The Labor Administration does not duplicate the work of any other agency in the Department, and I do not intend that it shall set up any field force which would duplicate anything else that the Department or any other Department is doing. Rather, the Agricultural Labor Administration under my supervision is directing the entire labor program for the Department. It allocates portions of the job to the agencies which are in a position to carry them out. For example, the local recruitment is a job for the Extension Service, and we have turned the job over to them. In the transportation of workers there are a number of Department people who have had experience in caring for people in camps, in transporting workers, and in similar activities. In view of the fact that we are facing a critical situation on farm labor, my sincere suggestion is that the Department be enabled to make use of the experience and facilities which it has in this field.

OBJECTIVES OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE IN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

I can sum up what we need by stating my objectives in this labor program under three points, as follows:

(1) That the Extension Service have adequate funds to carry out the local mobilization of labor.

(2) That the Department be provided enough money to move the people that can be obtained and that are needed to cultivate and harvest this year's crops.

(3) That if the Department of Agriculture is to have responsibility for this job, adequate authority be given to the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the rapidly changing situation and that he be authorized to make use of the experience and facilities both within and without the Department that are best suited for this task.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT HAS HAD FULL OPERATING RESPONSIBILITY FOR FARM LABOR PROGRAM ONLY SINCE JANUARY 23, 1943

From what I have heard of the debate on House Joint Resolution 96 in the House, I feel that the Department has not made its position clear enough. I should like at this time to clarify as best I can certain points upon which at present there seems to be some misunderstanding.

First. The Department has had full operating responsibility for this labor program only since January 23 of this year, 2 months ago. On that date Chairman McNutt of the War Manpower Commission issued a directive placing in me the responsibility for recruiting, transporting, and placing of farm workers. I think it most important that it be clearly understood that up to that time the Department had very little to say about where workers should go and about the number of workers who should be made available in any one place. That was the responsibility of the U. S. Employment Service. In other words, until January 23 there was a divided authority and responsibility for the farm labor program.

HOW PROBLEM WAS HANDLED PRIOR TO JANUARY 23, 1943

Before January 23, the department had no authority to recruit workers but it provided transportation for workers who were recruited by the United States Employment Service. All certifications for workers were made by the United States Employment Service. The Department moved all the Mexicans that the United States Employment Service certified were needed. I think it particularly important that the Senators and Representatives from the long staple cotton areas understand very clearly that there never was last fall any certification by the Federal Employment Service of Mexicans for that work.

FORMER DIVIDED AUTHORITY BETWEEN UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE AND AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Senator HAYDEN. The complaint that was made in that particular was that the Department of Agriculture should not take away from the Employment Service the recruitment and the transportation of the farm laborers. In other words, it was said that the United States Employment Service by reasonably long experience was better qualified in the first instance, in the recruitment and in the transportation of the labor, than a new agency set up in another department.

Secretary WICKARD. I may say in the case of long-stapled cotton, we only did what we were directed to do by the War Manpower Commission. The United States Employment Service certified the need for workers and told us where they were going to need them.

Senator HAYDEN. The point is, however, that up to that time, or until the Farm Security Administration entered the picture, the recruitment and transportation of farm labor was in the hands of the United States Employment Service. The complaint is that there was a duplication of effort when the Farm Security Administration stepped in and assumed the function that properly belonged to the United States Employment Service.

Mr. WEBSTER. Senator, the United States Employment Service had the responsibility for recruiting but did not have for transportation. At no time did the Employment Service do any transporting of farm workers.

Secretary WICKARD. What we did was to transport them upon certification of the United States Employment Service.

Senator HAYDEN. The point is, whoever did the job should have done the whole job. The workers were recruited by one agency, and they had to go to another agency of the Government to get transportation money. There was a duplication there that ought not to have been. Ordinarily, a business concern that wants some employees would send a man out to hire them and pay their way to the factory and the same procedure should have been followed here. There were two agencies, and they did not work well together.

Secretary WICKARD. We merely did what we were asked to do by the Employment Service and that was to transport these workers.

PURPOSE OF DIRECTIVE FROM WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Perhaps, as you pointed out, there was an overlapping. I think that what Mr. McNutt had in mind when he gave me this directive was to get it all in one place.

The Department recruited workers in areas in this country where the Employment Service said there was a surplus; that is, up to January 23. Now, under the directive from Mr. McNutt which gives full operating authority and responsibility to the Department of Agriculture, we are in a better position to determine the needs of a given area and to put workers in that area to the extent possible. It gives agriculture much better utilization of the services of the United States Employment Service with which we are closely cooperating.

COMPLAINT THAT THERE HAS BEEN DELAY IN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Second. In the debate in the House it appeared that some Congressmen felt that the Department had not moved as rapidly as it should have because we had not spent all the money that had been allocated to us from the President's emergency fund. I think one reason for this is the split responsibility of which I have already spoken. A second reason is that the program itself was on an experimental basis and we were more or less feeling our way.

AMOUNT ALLOTTED FROM PRESIDENT'S EMERGENCY FUND AND OBLIGATIONS AS OF JANUARY 31, 1943

Third. The whole amount available for the transportation program from the President's emergency fund was only $4,500,000 and of this amount only $1,500,000 was made available to us up to December 15, 1942. As of January 31, 1943, our obligations were $1,507,000.

REASON MORE FARM WORKERS HAVE NOT BEEN MOVED DURING PAST FEW MONTHS

Fourth. We have not moved tremendous numbers of workers in the last few months partly because this is a period of the year when farm work is rather light. We have gained enough experience to

know what is required, to know what it costs to move people about, to house them, and to return them when the work is done. On the basis of that experience and in order to provide adequate funds for the full crop year, we submitted the estimate which was considered in the House.

COMPLAINT THAT UNDER BUDGET ESTIMATE EXTENSION SERVICE WOULD DO 90 PERCENT OF WORK FOR LOCAL MOBILIZATION AND RECEIVE ONLY 10 PERCENT OF FUNDS

Fifth. The statement was made a number of times in the House that under the Department's proposal 90 percent of the work would be done by the Extension Service for local mobilization of labor and 10 percent by the Farm Security Administration for transporting and housing, but that 90 percent of the money would go for transporting and housing and only 10 percent for local mobilization. On its face this statement seems true. Actually it is somewhat misleading. The reason it is misleading is that there is a vast difference in the amount of work required to place a volunteer worker for a short-time harvesting job and the work required to handle the recruitment, transportation, and placement and return of a seasonal worker. For example, if a Government clerk decides to work 2 weeks helping pick apples in Virginia, he is counted, roughly, as one of the three and one-half million people we are hoping to get onto the farms for the peak of the harvest season. He signs up with a local office, goes out to work, eats the food provided on the farm, gets his money, and returns to his home. It is a relatively simple operation as far as the Government is concerned and with a relatively small amount of administrative money a large number of such workers can be handled.

In contrast to the city worker going on the farm, as I have just described, consider the case of a Mexican brought into this country.

First of all we have to send people to Mexico to help recruit the worker. We have to inspect the worker to see that he is fit to enter this country and physically able to do the work. We have to make provision for getting him on a train. We have to arrange for feeding him while he is en route. He has to be taken across an international border. When he arrives he has to be placed in a camp. After he is placed on a farm we have to see that part of his pay is withheld to be paid to him when he returns to his own country. Furthermore, if after working in one area for several weeks it is found that he is needed somewhere else the whole transportation process must be repeated. Finally, at the end of the season he has to be returned to his point of origin. This is an altogether different operation than the simple one of recruiting a city man for a short-time job on a farm. These migrant workers will probably average 6 months or more each while the volunteer workers will probably average a month or so. Thus it can be seen that 300,000 seasonal workers for 6 months are approximately the equivalent of 1,800,000 volunteer workers who go out for just a month or so.

These migratory workers cost money. Often they do a type of heavy manual labor which many of our volunteer workers are not suited for. Most of the money for the migratory workers goes to the

railroads for transportation or goes for materials for housing. Actually the amount of money contemplated for administrative expenses for the mobilization and for the transporting and housing is not far different. For example, the work to be done by Extension calls for approximately 2,600 employees with total salaries estimated at $4,700,000, while the transportation and housing calls for approximately 2,500 people with salaries estimated at $4,744,000.

HOW FARM WORKERS ARE PAID

Senator THOMAS. Who pays the per diem of these workers?

Secretary WICKARD. Mexicans?

Senator THOMAS. Either or both.

Secretary WICKARD. In the local case it is entirely up to the people in the area.

Senator THOMAS. You mean the American producers?

Secretary WICKARD. If it is recruited locally.

Senator THOMAS. Suppose they are not recruited locally?

Secretary WICKARD. Up to 200 miles?

Senator THOMAS. Well, say a thousand miles away?

Secretary WICKARD. Then, the Government pays up to the 200 miles.

Senator THOMAS. Pays the cost of transportation and subsistence, and the salary of the worker, when he is doing work for a private individual, or a private company?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes. That is right.

Senator THOMAS. How do you justify that?

Senator RUSSELL. You mean that the Government pays the compensation for work, for doing the work on the farm?

Secretary WICKARD. No; not for doing the work on the farm.

Senator THOMAS. That was my question.

Secretary WICKARD. No; the transportation and other expenses involved outside of the 200 miles are paid by the Government. But the farmer himself pays in wages whatever the agreement calls for.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR PAYMENT OF FARM WORKERS

Senator THOMAS. Well, who stands responsible for seeing that these workers get their regular per diem, 6 days a week, or 7 days a week, as the case may be?

Secretary WICKARD. That is a matter of contract with the growers, who ask that these workers be brought in.

Senator THOMAS. Suppose you bring in a great number and they do not get a contract; then who pays them?

Secretary WICKARD. They have to have the contract before they are brought in.

We have a contract with the Mexicans. Do you know whether we have a contract in the case of the Bahamas?

Mr. DARROW. We are signing up the contracts right now.

Senator THOMAS. With whom?

Mr. DARROW. With the growers.

Secretary WICKARD. With the growers. That is why we ask for contracts in advance, so that will be taken care of.

EXTENT OF BURDEN ASSUMED BY THE GOVERNMENT AND BY CONTRACTORS

Senator THOMAS. At this point, if you will make it clear, if possible, to me, just what burden the Government is to assume and what burden the contractors are to assume now and tell us what expenses the Government is going to pay.

Secretary WICKARD. Now, are you talking about interstate or international movements?

Senator THOMAS. If there is a difference, I would like to have that.

Secretary WICKARD. With the Mexicans——

Senator THOMAS. Well, if there is a difference, I would like to have a statement about the local and a statement about the international.

Secretary WICKARD. In the case of the local workers—and that work is entirely placed under the Extension Service, according to the instructions promulgated by the Department—the person who would volunteer to work would arrange for his own transportation. He would arrange for his rate of pay, for housing and possibly his food with the man for whom he is to work. We merely get, that is, the Extension people get, a list of people who will volunteer for this class of work, and encourage people to so volunteer.

Now then, if we are going to transport people across State lines, we ask that the grower or association of growers enter into a contract with the Government to take so many workers at a certain rate of pay for a certain period of time and then we attempt to get the workers recruited and transport them, and in both cases, I believe, collect the money—the money is collected from the grower after the people have been delivered to the area wherein they are to work.

METHOD OF PAYING WAGES

Senator RUSSELL. What money is collected from the grower?

Secretary WICKARD. The wages.

Senator RUSSELL. The wages?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Senator RUSSELL. So the workers that you transport across State lines receive their money from a Government agency and the Government agency in turn collects it from the grower?

Mr. DARROW. May I enter in here on that, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Mr. DARROW. The grower pays the worker directly. The Government transports the worker and gives him subsistence until he gets to work. Then the contract becomes operative and the grower pays the worker for his work. Does that answer your question?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes.

QUESTION AS TO STEPS TAKEN TO SEE THAT WORK IS PERFORMED

Senator HOLMAN. Is there any policing of the labor after it is transported to see that it actually works and does not hop another train and get transportation to some other place?

Mr. DARROW. The migratory workers are put mainly in Government or similar camps. There is a camp manager who deals with the grower who comes in wanting labor, and a check is maintained.

Senator HOLMAN. I understand about that. I have been in those migratory camps. But suppose he does not labor, after you have transported him around the country, what are you going to do about it?

Mr. DARROW. The Government uses every effort to get him placed in agricultural work. It undertakes to do that and to see that he is subsequently returned to where he was recruited.

PADRONE SYSTEM NOT USED IN WORKING OF IMPORTED MEXICAN LABOR

Secretary WICKARD. That is the case of the migratory labor. You referred to the Mexican labor. If he proves satisfactory——

Senator THOMAS (interposing). It is not possible to get any satisfactory service out of Mexicans, unless you have a group of Mexicans and a Mexican foreman in charge of the group, and they have to work in sort of platoons, or squadrons.

Secretary WICKARD. Well, they are kept in groups, but I do not think that we have made arrangements for a padrone system. Is that what you are talking about?

Senator THOMAS. Well, that is the system. I do not know whether you have that in mind.

Secretary WICKARD. No; we are not using that. The Mexican Government would not agree to that sort of a thing.

REQUIREMENTS FOR EMPLOYING MEXICANS

Senator THOMAS. What do they require?

Secretary WICKARD. Well, they require that we supervise their travel; see that they are given the work; that their wages are paid; a certain amount of money is to be set aside to be given to them when they return to Mexico; and we also have to see that these men are given work three-fourths of the time; that is, that they are able to work four days and a half a week.

Senator BANKHEAD. Has any arrangement been made as to hours for them to work?

Secretary WICKARD. I do not think there is any minimum number of hours.

Mr. DARROW. The statement in the contract is 8 hours to 12 hours.

Senator TYDINGS. Mr. Secretary——

Secretary WICKARD. There is a formal contract that we negotiated with Mexico when I was in Mexico City last summer, which is used as the framework for this.

NUMBER OF WORKERS TO BE OBTAINED UNDER BUDGET ESTIMATE

Senator TYDINGS. What number of workers do you think you will get under this system as an estimate?

Senator BANKHEAD. You mean workers from Mexico?

Senator TYDINGS. I mean from any place.

Secretary WICKARD. Well, we are hoping that we will get around three and one-half to four million.

Senator TYDINGS. Do you think you will?

Secretary WICKARD. Altogether, I think so.

Senator TYDINGS. Now, I know that you are going to try; but what does it look like the possibilities are at this juncture?

Secretary WICKARD. Well, I think they are improving quite a little bit, Senator. It looks to me like it is a lot better than it was a few weeks ago. One thing, we have got a lot of people now who formerly were in agriculture who are now going back to the farms.

Senator TYDINGS. Would you think that about half the number you are shooting at would be a certainty and the other half problematical, or where would be the dividing line?

Secretary WICKARD. It will be more than half, certainly.

Senator TYDINGS. Two million, would you say?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; more than that.

SOURCES FROM WHICH FARM LABOR IS TO BE OBTAINED

Senator BANKHEAD. Where are they coming from?

Secretary WICKARD. School children; older people; people who are going to find it difficult to be employed in the less essential industries; one kind or another.

Senator TYDINGS. Where are you going to get them? For example, do you look for them in particular sections of the country like the South, the Southwest, the North, or where do you think the bulk of them will come from?

Secretary WICKARD. Well, I think most of them will come from the small towns and cities; county seats, particularly. There are going to be a number of them come from the larger cities.

MIGRATORY WORKERS

Senator TYDINGS. How about the old type of groups that started in in Florida, came up with the seasons and the crops, and went through Maryland, up into New Jersey and so on?

Secretary WICKARD. There are a few of those and that is why we are trying to get the Bahamans to come in.

BILL TO ESTABLISH A JUNIOR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

[See pp. 25, 32]

Senator TYDINGS. Just to divert you for a moment, have you seen the bill I have introduced, S. 880, for a junior army, for the recruitment from 14 to 18?

Secretary WICKARD. I have read about it in the papers.

Senator TYDINGS. I would like for you to look at it and give me your opinion. It is purely voluntarily, but it would supplement your efforts in case the numbers which you are shooting at should not materialize, and it appeared to me that this might be a supernumerary force that you might bring in.

Secretary WICKARD. I believe the Extension Service, Mr. Wilson, has planned something along that line. What do you call it, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. A voluntary farm corps.

Secretary WICKARD. A voluntary farm corps. Now, Senator Tydings' bill refers to those 14 to 18 years old.

Senator TYDINGS. That is right and is all voluntary, too; but it should be from all over the country and to start now. Some of these

boys and girls ought to have a little preliminary training—perhaps a few hours. For instance, what I am thinking of is this: When the crops become ripe and you may not have this labor, sufficient to spread all around to suit everybody, obviously, unless you have some force on the job then to harvest the crop, either all of it, or a part of it, the crops are lost to the extent labor is not available.

SOCIAL SECURITY STATUS OF OLD PEOPLE

Senator THOMAS. You referred to old people.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Senator THOMAS. Now, I do not know much about the situation in other States; but in my State of Oklahoma, we have a social security system operating that applies to people 65 or over. Great numbers of those people are able to work to some extent, and they want to work; but because of fear that if they accept a job and make a little money on the side, they will be cut off from their social security benefits or social security enrollment, they do not care to take the chance.

Now, there is a bill pending before the Finance Committee, I think it is, to permit them to accept employment on the side and make some more money, which, of course, should be done; but until that amendment is passed by the Congress, I do not think that they will take a chance and there is that reservoir of labor denied to this program.

Secretary WICKARD. I hope some steps are taken so those people will feel free to accept employment on the farms. I believe the Governor of your State spoke to me about it and is interested in that. I told him at the time that it seemed to me that was a very good piece of legislation. I hope it won't require legislation.

Senator HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a legislative bill we have before us, and if you have an idea of that kind that ought to be put into effect, we can amend this bill to include it.

Senator THOMAS. I will not ask you to answer that now, but I would like for you to consider it.

Secretary WICKARD. I can give you my reactions now. I think it would be advisable.

Senator RUSSELL. Suppose you have someone in the Department of Agriculture prepare an amendment along that line.

TEXT OF BILL RELATING TO OLD-AGE-ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Senator THOMAS. There is a bill which has been introduced, and I will insert a copy of it in the record at this point.

(The bill referred to follows:)

[S. 685, 78th Cong., 1st Sess.]

A BILL Relating to old-age-assistance payments under the Social Security Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title I of the Social Security Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 7. The amount of old-age assistance payable under this title to any individual shall not be reduced or diminished in any manner by reason of the fact that the earnings of such individual amount to $240 or less during any calendar year, and no individual who is otherwise qualified to receive old-age assistance under

this title shall be denied such assistance by reason of the fact that such individual has earned $240 or less during the period of twelve months immediately preceding the receipt of his claim for such assistance."

Secretary WICKARD. The social security people would be the logical people, would they not, to prepare it? I am not sure what the restrictions are or what the conditions are as to these people. I do not know whether it is psychological or actual.

Senator RUSSELL. I think that depends largely on the State law.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes. I have been told that the States have laws affecting that.

Senator RUSSELL. It is not Federal. The States have different systems. In some States they now have the requirement that a person shall not work, but in others they do have an opportunity to accept employment, and we could handle it easily enough by legislation by providing, for instance, that 6 months thereafter no State shall participate in Federal funds who had the requirement that a person cannot engage in agriculture for profit.

Secretary WICKARD. Would that have a tendency in some cases to defeat it, because the legislatures could not act?

Senator HAYDEN. It would not require any State legislation. It is only an administration of State law. That is all it amounts to.

Secretary WICKARD. It would just require the State to change its regulations.

Senator HAYDEN. Yes.

Secretary WICKARD. Let me just conclude by making this one statement.

PART OF RECRUITED WORKERS WILL WORK ONLY SHORT PERIODS OF TIME

Senator RUSSELL. There is one point that I want to clarify. You stated in answer to Senator Tydings' question, that you thought that you could recruit three and one-half million workers. Now, do you include in that three and one-half million workers those who will work for only very short periods?

Secretary WICKARD. That is right.

Senator RUSSELL. And the greater part of them will be people who will not work for more than a few weeks?

Secretary WICKARD. That is right.

Senator RUSSELL. I think that ought to be made clear, because that three and one-half million sounds very impressive, but that three and one-half million could work out so that there would only be three and one-half million man-days on the farm, because each could just work 1 day.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JUNIOR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

[See pp. 25, 32]

Senator TYDINGS. Mr. Secretary, I am going to offer as an amendment to this bill a proposition to be under your direction, for the recruitment on a voluntary basis of an army from 14 to 18. I would like for you to look at a copy of the bill, at your leisure, and as soon as you can, I would like to have and would appreciate it if you would give either your approval or disapproval, or suggest how the bill could be improved, and how it could be made to work.

Secretary WICKARD. I will be glad to.

PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY FARM WORKERS

Senator HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of the Secretary's formal statement, I request that the discussion be separated into two divisions of farm labor. There is one division of migratory labor where laborers follow the seasons and follow the crops. Those are the crop gatherers; the harvest takers. There is another kind of farm labor; the every day farm labor, that has to milk the cows and feed the hogs and tend to the poultry and get off the truck garden products. I think the discussion would be more intelligent if you could draw a sharp line between those two kinds of labor and discuss each separately; devote a part of the discussion to one kind of labor until we have disposed of that, and then take up the other, if you please. Do you consider that a logical approach?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes. There is what we call the permanent, all-year-round type of labor, which is now giving me more concern, because we are in the off season and also because they are harder to obtain than any other group and we do have the migratory people. They may work most of the year. Then we have the seasonal type, like the school children and people who go on vacations and go out to farms.

We have also had this fluctuation, Senator, as I have explained, of between a little over 8,000,000 up to almost 12,000,000 every year from the peak to the low point in the number of people, and some of them are just out there for a few weeks harvesting fruit and doing other work on the farm.

EMPLOYMENT OF INDIANS

Senator THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one other question if I may. We have in the country a very large number of Indians and they are discriminated against in that they do not seem to be able to get jobs.

Have you taken up the matter with the Indian Bureau to see whether or not you could recruit those men. In my opinion, there are great numbers of them that could be secured. A great many of our States have large numbers. Arizona has a great number and Oklahoma, my State, has a great number. There are about 20 States that have an Indian population, but 4 or 5 States have large numbers. California has a large number.

Secretary WICKARD. Would they be willing to work on farms?

Senator HAYDEN. I might add, Senator Thomas, that the Navajos have been working in the Salt River Valley, and they are very industrious and very successful. We have had the Papagos and the Pimas, which are large tribes, about 5,000 each, employed every year assisting in cotton picking, and they are some of the best cotton pickers we have. They are the cleanest and most careful cotton pickers that can be found. The only regret now is that there are not more of them at that season of the year. We have not been so successful with the Apaches, which is another large tribe, as agricultural workers; but they have been employed on road work and other outdoor labor.

84461—43——2

I think that matter has been fairly well explored, and the results have been quite satisfactory in my State, although the Department of Agriculture might encourage it to a greater extent.

Secretary WICKARD. We surely do not want to overlook any opportunity. I believe Mr. Darrow was telling me about trying to get some Chinese out of the eastern part of the country to go out West, and the people out there are very happy to get Chinese labor. Any other source we can think of, we certainly want to utilize.

Senator THOMAS. When we set up the C. C. C. camps to take care of the young boys, they also set up the same thing for the Indians, and they were most successful. The Indians appreciated it and flocked in there, and they did good work. Now, there is a basis for it. When the W. P. A. was set up, the Indian Office organized W. P. A. camps, and they were most successful. So, there is a source of supply; I cannot say to what extent, but it ought to be explored and those available should be given a chance to get this added employment.

AMENDMENTS TO PERMIT EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND EXPENDITURES FOR PRINTING AND BINDING

Secretary WICKARD. Mr. Chairman, I believe I can conclude with about one paragraph, because we have covered so many things that I was going to discuss. If you do not mind I will conclude, and then we will be glad to answer questions. The bill as passed by the House should be amended to authorize employment of personnel in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, and so forth. I believe Mr. Maycock has given the clerk of the committee some proposed language which will cover these points.

BASIC ISSUE INVOLVED

I just want to make this statement concerning the basic issue. The basic issue it seems to me is this: If the Congress wants me to do this job it should give me commensurate funds and authority to carry out the responsibility that has been placed in me. If the Congress does not want me to do this job it should make that fact very clear and both the responsibility and authority for doing this task should be definitely fixed. I am ready to do everything in my power to get the farmer the labor he must have.

I think that is the basic issue, and I would like to see it very carefully considered.

Senator LODGE. And if you are given the funds and authority, you think you can do the job?

Secretary WICKARD. Well, I suppose I will be pardoned for saying I think we have more interest and experience than any other organization; but I would not want to make the flat categorical expression that we could take care of all of the labor needs, Senator.

EFFECT ON MEXICAN AGREEMENT OF PROVISO PERTAINING TO MINIMUM WAGES, HOUSING STANDARDS, HOURS OF WORK, ETC.

Senator HAYDEN. There is one proviso in the bill on page 5, which I would like to call to your attention.

Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agri-

culture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of section 3 (f), 7 (c), and 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

That provision is in conflict, apparently, with the agreement that you have made with respect to the importation of Mexican labor.

Secretary WICKARD. I should so consider it. I have been wondering what would happen when the bill as it passed the House was made known in Mexico. I do not know whether they would stop the recruiting that is now going on or not.

Senator HAYDEN. The Mexican agreement, as I remember it, provided that you should guarantee a minimum wage of 30 cents an hour or equivalent of that, if it was by piecework.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. And further that there should be some examination as to standards of housing and matters of that kind.

The proviso I read from the House measure apparently would interfere with such provisions in that agreement.

Would it help the situation if we inserted, for instance, after the word "labor" in line 6, the following:

from one part of the continental United States to another shall be used.

Then the prohibition that is in the House bill would relate strictly to the interstate movement of labor, whereas it would not interfere with your Mexican contracts.

Secretary WICKARD. I would not be sure whether your amendment applies to interstate or just international.

Senator HAYDEN. The amendment I suggested to the proviso would require that the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor from one part of the continental United States to another shall not be used directly or indirectly to accomplish these ends.

Secretary WICKARD. May I ask, Senator, is it your idea that you leave this prohibition which we have here apply only to intrastate movements, or to interstate, or are you trying to keep it from applying to international?

Senator HAYDEN. I only want to exclude the international movement of labor from the proviso by saying it shall apply only to the movement of labor within a State or from one State to another State.

Now, I do not know whether that will serve the purpose.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; that would help, Senator, not only with our work in recruiting labor in Mexico, but our present agreement with the Bahaman Government in which we have been engaged.

WAGES GUARANTEED TO IMPORTED LABOR

Senator HAYDEN. What is the minimum wage you guarantee to the Bahamans?

Secretary WICKARD. The same as to the Mexicans.

Senator HAYDEN. You cannot get them unless they knew before leaving what wages they were going to get?

Secretary WICKARD. No, sir. We have already entered into that agreement. I believe I spoke to you about that. We are trying to

get Bahaman labor into Florida this week and we should move them. I think I might also tell you that we are negotiating with other areas in the Caribbean.

Senator HAYDEN. I will be obliged if you will have someone look at the text along the line I have suggested. I am not proud of these particular words. We might say "the placement of domestic farm labor."

Senator TYDINGS. Your idea is that the international field should be excluded?

Senator HAYDEN. Yes; exclude the international.

GUARANTY OF WAGES TO LABOR TRANSPORTED INTERSTATE

Secretary WICKARD. There is one thing that I wish to ask. You would not want to give, for instance, any kind of a guaranty to a man or a woman going from New York City, we will say, to Vermont, or other places, to do farm work? Do you think that that could be arranged without any guaranty of wages?

Last year we transported, you know, Senator Hayden, into your State a number of people from Missouri after the cotton season was over there.

Now, I think at that time we told those people before they left Missouri that they would get the minimum or going wage. I am just saying that some people in this country may also feel that they ought to be given some assurance before they are going to be willing to move.

REGULATION OF WAGES

Senator HAYDEN. I am reading the House text, which says:

directly or indirectly, to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages.

Now, let us stop right there. Do you directly or indirectly regulate or impose minimum wages? Do you ask the farmer who wants to employ these laborers how much he will pay and he tells you how much he will pay, or do you have to fix the wage?

Secretary WICKARD. He does that himself.

Senator TYDINGS. When he makes a request for so much labor from you, your agency, I would assume, he would put with his request what he is going to pay, then when you are recruiting you say, "If you go out to this or that State they will offer you a minimum of so much." Am I correct in that?

Secretary WICKARD. When we enter into a contract with these people we say that the minimum wage will be 30 cents an hour or the local wage, whichever is higher.

Senator TYDINGS. But you have ascertained that from the requesting source before you make the contract, so that the contract you make is in accordance, more or less, with the wages that exist in the new field.

Secretary WICKARD. Well, in California, for instance, we paid the Mexicans 65 cents an hour for work in the sugar-beet fields, which was much higher than the 30 cents, because that was the going wage.

Senator TYDINGS. To take a specific case, suppose you are transporting these people from Missouri to work in the cotton fields. When your agents went among them to see if they would go they would say, "What will we get when we get out there?" And you would have to ascertain in advance what the requesting source offered to pay, and notify them, would you not?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes. In this case, before they were transported we told them what they would get.

Senator TYDINGS. That is right.

Senator RUSSELL. Not only that, but you had a contract with a man who was going to employ them in New Mexico where they agreed to pay it.

Secretary WICKARD. That is right.

EFFECT OF HOUSE PROVISO ON CONTRACTS FOR MINIMUM WAGES

Senator RUSSELL. Under the provisions of the House bill you could not have a contract with a man in New Mexico who employed these people in Missouri.

Secretary WICKARD. Apparently not, even though the man was willing to enter into a contract——

Senator RUSSELL. It seems to me that that would cause a great deal of confusion, because suppose a man came into your office in New Mexico and said, "I will pay 30 cents an hour," or——

Secretary WICKARD. Three cents a pound.

Senator RUSSELL. Or 2 cents a pound, or $3 a hundred for picking cotton, and after the people got out there he might decide he did not want to pay it. Who guarantees this man that he will get the rate promised?

Secretary WICKARD. My theory is that the people will not go when they find out that there is no definite understanding; but I do not think in the local areas, on the local basis, it is necessary, because it may be——

Senator RUSSELL. But that is not a local basis.

Secretary WICKARD. They will go backward or forward, wherever they please. It may be that they are employed by John Jones and they will want to go and work for his neighbor tomorrow. We cannot transport people from Missouri out there unless there is some sort of an agreement as to what they will get when they arrive.

Senator RUSSELL. If you do not have an agreement, would there not be an inclination to have an exaggeration of the number of workers you needed, in a particular field, so as to be sure to have enough; and you might get a great many of them out there, and find out that you did not have employment for them?

That ought not to be. I do not see how it would work, otherwise.

RESULT WHERE THERE IS NO FIXED STANDARD OF WAGES

Senator OVERTON. If there is no fixed standard and the farmers will advise you what wages they are willing to pay, you get into a com-

petitive situation where farmer groups are competing one with another. One will offer much more than another group in order to get the labor, and I am afraid you are going to have a sort of a runaway situation. I think some consideration ought to be given to that feature of it, because if it is just left open for the farmers to determine what they are going to pay, and they are very anxious for labor, some will offer much more than others. Those who need the labor just as badly as those who are willing to pay more, will not get the labor, and those who are willing to go out and pay more will get the labor.

USE OF THE GOING WAGE IN A GIVEN LOCALITY

Secretary WICKARD. I might say this, Senator, what we have done in the past is to ascertain what the going wage was and fix that. We have done that under the sugar-beet law for quite a long time.

Now, then, that serves as a stabilizer both for the grower and for the employee and tends to keep things from going wild either way, because if there happens to be a great scarcity, you do not get enough. You see how the tendency is, as you say, to bid up. If there happens to be more than are needed, of course, people will bid down; and that fixes the standard for work very successfully. I do not think we have had any trouble on wages outside of the experience we had in the long-staple cotton last fall, in which the question involved was more the piece rate.

Senator OVERTON. I was just going to ask how you were going to handle the situation. We will say that you want a certain number of laborers in the cotton area, and they are going to be advised just how much they are going to get.

Secretary WICKARD. If we are going to transport them from long distances, under the present agreement, we would tell them; but under this, apparently, we could not tell them.

Senator OVERTON. We will say in the Delta country in the Mississippi Valley, they would be willing to pay much more than those in Alabama and so the Delta people would get the labor. They would offer higher wages.

PAYMENT OF PREVAILING WAGE

Mr. DARROW. But, Senator, the prevailing wage is paid, and I think that in nearly every part of the United States the prevailing wage now is above that minimum. There are, of course, variations between States.

Senator OVERTON. You are going to pay the prevailing wage?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Senator OVERTON. How do you control the local wages?

Secretary WICKARD. A committee determines the local prevailing wages.

Senator OVERTON. Suppose someone wanted to bid more than the prevailing wage?

PROPOSED USE OF ARIZONA PLAN

Mr. DARROW. On that point, we have a plan which we would like to use this year known roughly as the Arizona plan, which was worked

out with some of the growers down there, and which we have proposed, informally, to growers in other parts of the country. I think it is an excellent plan. It is this: In order to avoid this thing I mentioned, where you get in one area different groups of growers competing for the labor supply, such as in the Southwest last fall, where the citrus growers were competing for labor with the cotton growers, under the Arizona plan, we would ask the growers in the area to get together—the big ones and the little ones, all who need labor—to work out what their total needs are, to make a composite of it, and then come to the Government and say for this area, for this period of time, these are our needs.

Senator TYDINGS. For this particular kind of work, too?

Mr. DARROW. For all these kinds of work.

Senator TYDINGS. Including citrus growing, too?

Mr. DARROW. Citrus fruits, cotton, and all of the rest. Say we need so many workers, and we need so many of them this week, and so many of them next week, and so many of them the next week. Then we can get a full utilization of the labor. Then we can recruit these forces, and bring them in there and supply the total needs.

It will greatly help, I think, on matters of wage stabilization. I believe that plan will be accepted gladly by growers in every part of the United States, where you have to bring in workers from outside.

Of course, as the Secretary has pointed out, we want to use local resources to the full, before coming in with a mobile labor program.

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF MOBILE WORKERS AND NUMBER TO BE OBTAINED FROM COMMUNITIES

Senator TYDINGS. Taking the 3,100,000 as it stands as the number needed, could you give us any estimate of the number of workers you are going to get of the mobile nature, and the number you expect to get from the communities; that is, either in percentages or in numbers?

Mr. DARROW. On the mobile workers, the normal number of migratory workers a number of years past for the whole country, all of the movements combined, has been estimated roughly at 500,000. That includes all types. They normally move around, following the crops.

Senator HAYDEN. Are you going to get half of that number?

Secretary WICKARD. We hope to.

Mr. DARROW. May I come to that by analyzing it out a little further?

Senator HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. DARROW. If you do not do anything at all about it there will be some movement—no one knows how much—perhaps 100,000; perhaps 125,000. We do not know. But the people do not have the transportation facilities they used to have. Gas and tires are not available for their jallopies. We are guessing roughly that perhaps you will get a movement of 125,000 and that you might have to fill in as many as 375,000 from somewhere outside, either locally or from some other source.

SHORTAGE OF MIGRATORY WORKERS

Senator TYDINGS. So that from the old standard yardstick on migratory labor, you have a void of around 350,000 to 375,000, estimated, that must come from somewhere.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Senator TYDINGS. Now, where are they going to come from, just that one group?

Mr. DARROW. That is a very great problem. Some will come from within this country, from the cities.

Senator TYDINGS. Usually from the communities, will they not? They will have to be augmented by extra help obtained in the communities. Where else can you get them?

Mr. DARROW. Locally, of course, we are going to have to get the utmost number we can. You are right there.

Senator TYDINGS. If we cannot get them and cannot get migratory labor, from migratory sources, where are you going to get them?

Mr. DARROW. Well, if you cannot get them locally and cannot get them from migratory sources, I do not know.

Senator RUSSELL. We just have not got them.

Senator TYDINGS. No.

MIGRATORY LABOR SUPPLY 25 PERCENT OF NORMAL

Senator THOMAS. You will have to go out and work yourself.

Senator TYDINGS. That is right. The point I am making is you are faced this year with an estimated availability of migratory labor of about 25 percent of the normal amount. Now, let us assume that by dint of good fortune you can build that up to 200,000, which I think will be a right smart achievement, considering everything, the drain by war industries, and so on. That leaves 350,000 people that you have to have on the spot to harvest the crops after they are ripe or they go to waste.

Senator HAYDEN. But, Senator, you want to remember this, that crops do not ripen at the same time in different parts of the United States.

Senator TYDINGS. No, no, but you have this 350,000 to do the different jobs all over the country.

Senator HAYDEN. In normal times, for example, half a million will start down in Texas, and then go up through New Mexico, and then on up into the Dakotas.

Senator TYDINGS. But the principle is the same, Senator.

Senator HAYDEN. Yes.

Senator TYDINGS. You need this help constantly always at some place.

Senator HAYDEN. That is right.

IMPORTANCE OF USE OF LOCAL LABOR

Senator TYDINGS. So that what I am getting at is you have not the migratory 350,000 after you build up the estimated available number with 75,000 additional, and I cannot imagine any other place in my own mind where you can increase the estimates. Take the truck-farming section, we might say, from Georgia all of the way north to northern New York. You cannot get the labor needed anywhere except to get it from the little towns and the communities under some sort of an arrangement.

Now, I have been trying to point out what is the best arrangement to get them there.

Mr. DARROW. We will have to come back to the locality. That is the first thing to do, to get the labor locally if you can and then only use mobile workers after you have obtained all of the labor locally you can.

Senator TYDINGS. But you cannot get it locally, can you?

Mr. DARROW. I think we shall be surprised how many we are going to get locally.

Senator TYDINGS. I think that you are going to have to make a very strong effort to get it.

Mr. DARROW. Well, the plans have been worked out. The recruitment plans are ready to go, some of them already under way such as the high-school plans; particularly the high-school farm volunteers, which Mr. Wilson will tell you about. That move is already under way.

People are aroused in this country about the need for farm labor and our contacts indicate that in every walk of life people are going to go all out to see that the labor gets there, locally.

FARM LABOR SITUATION ON EASTERN SHORE OF MARYLAND

Senator TYDINGS. Well, you come back to the same proposition. You can take the Eastern Shore of Maryland, which is one of the most productive areas in the country. They start out with cucumbers and watermelons and strawberries and sweet potatoes and white potatoes and almost everything for the New York, Philadelphia, and some for the Baltimore markets. Last year I had the problem up with the Secretary and with you gentlemen, and the farmers had a terrible time. They could not get the labor. Finally, we tried to recruit it some place else, and it just was not there. Now, this year those people are all getting ready to plant and they remind me, they say, "We will put in the crops if you will tell us where we can get somebody to harvest them," and I have thought and thought as to what we are going to do to get these thousands of people that are needed to go over there, into the tomato patches, for one thing, and harvest that terrific volume of perishable food.

Mr. DARROW. I think, Senator, we will be able to get some.

Senator TYDINGS. There will be much more difficulty in getting the labor this year than there was last year.

Mr. DARROW. We know that there are a great many migratory workers who are available in normal times, but not as many as are needed this year.

Senator TYDINGS. Let us pursue this for just a minute more. I had all of this up last year. They came over here by droves. I suppose that there are 150 to 200 canning houses in that area for tomatoes, sweet corn, and other vegetables. Take a concern like Phillips food people. They could put up a great deal more if they could get the help.

They couldn't get the help, and any number of them lost a considerable amount of their crops. They are writing this in to me, and I don't know what to tell them. I know we want to do all we can. I think you have to get your high-school people and have them there. If you don't need them, fine; but if you do have to have them, to save these crops, they have to be organized ahead of time and be on the

ground. Otherwise, you are going to have crop losses this second straight year.

Mr. DARROW. I agree; but in some localities you will have to get some help from Mexico and the Bahamas.

WORK NOW BEING DONE IN ORGANIZING HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Senator RUSSELL. In some of the States they are now organizing the high-school students. In my own State, I think probably all the high schools have been registering their students and finding out who will be available for work. I know at least some steps have been taken in other States.

Secretary WICKARD. That is right.

Senator TYDINGS. Mr. Chairman, I have a copy of S. 880, which is two or three pages long. Would it divert the committee if I read it now?

Senator RUSSELL. I have read it.

Senator TYDINGS. I don't think some of the others have seen it.

SEASONAL LABOR IS MOSTLY UNSKILLED

Senator OVERTON. Before you do that, may I ask a question? How many of the three-odd million you expect to recruit under this program are inexperienced labor, from the towns and cities and high schools?

Mr. DARROW. Seasonal labor is practically all unskilled labor. As another Senator pointed out—Senator Holman, I believe—there is another very great problem of getting the experienced farm workers. But on this 3½ million the Secretary mentioned, he had reference to seasonal workers. There you have largely unskilled workers. You have Mexicans, for instance, who are very used to that sort of thing. You have people who normally do that sort of thing during the year. But you can, on seasonal work, use unskilled labor, including stout boys and girls and stout women, particularly if they have had some farm experience. You can also use men from the cities, sometimes businessmen and girls in the towns can go out and do that sort of thing. The seasonal work is largely unskilled work.

Senator OVERTON. For instance, the work such as gathering cotton, and so on, that would be seasonal?

Mr. DARROW. That would be seasonal.

Senator OVERTON. Of course, a good cotton gatherer is a skilled workman.

Mr. DARROW. That is right.

Senator OVERTON. And an experienced workman. I suppose a high-school boy could gather about 50 pounds in a day.

Senator RUSSELL. That depends upon the boy. Some of them can pick 200 pounds.

Senator OVERTON. I am talking about taking out of high schools those who don't know anything about cotton picking. Of course, with these farm boys it would be a different thing.

QUESTION AS TO WHETHER FARMERS DESIRE INEXPERIENCED LABOR

Another question I would like to ask is whether this inexperienced labor is desired by the farmers, and if they are paid the same as the experienced workers.

Mr. DARROW. I think the farmer would always prefer the more experienced help, the kind of help he has become accustomed to. Normally you have about three and a half million seasonal workers coming in, some of them from far away, on these seasonal migratory movements. The farmer, of course, would rather have that kind of help and he would this year get quite a lot of that by normal processes. The farmers I have talked to, who are desperately in need of labor, are willing, I think, to take any labor they can get rather than lose the crops.

Senator TYDINGS. That is right.

Mr. DARROW. I think the farmer will put up with getting what labor he can get.

TEXT OF S. 880 TO ESTABLISH A JUNIOR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

[See p. 32]

Senator TYDINGS. Now, Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to read this bill, which is right on this line I am talking about [reading]:

[S. 880, 78th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To establish a Junior Army of the United States for the purpose of organizing the youth of the Nation on a voluntary basis in order that they may contribute more effectively to the war effort, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture (herein referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to establish, under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture, an organization to be known as the Junior Army of the United States and to consist of boys and girls between the ages of fourteen and eighteen years who volunteer for service in the Junior Army. The purpose of the Junior Army shall be to provide an effective method through which the services of such boys and girls may be made available and utilized, on a purely voluntary basis, for aid in the production, harvesting, and distribution of agricultural commodities and in the performance of other useful work or activities in which they are qualified to render services which will contribute to the effective prosecution of the war.

SEC. 2. (a) Boys and girls between the ages of fourteen and eighteen years who meet such requirements of eligibility as may be established by the Secretary may, with the written consent of their parents or guardians, be enlisted in the Junior Army. Enlistments shall be for a period of three months and may be renewed. Members of the Junior Army shall be known as junior soldiers, and shall be divided into grades corresponding to grades in the Army of the United States from colonel to private. Assignment to such grades shall be in accordance with, and the qualifications for and duties of the several grades shall be determined under, regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(b) The Secretary shall provide suitable caps or hats and buttons or pins or other insignia of appropriate design for junior soldiers, for the purpose of indicating their membership and their rank or grade in the Junior Army.

(c) Upon the completion of any period of satisfactory service of three months or more in the Junior Army, any junior soldier shall be entitled to a certificate of honorable discharge and shall be entitled to retain the cap or hat and insignia issued to him. Any junior soldier may withdraw from the Junior Army at any time, but no certificate of honorable discharge shall be issued upon withdrawal prior to the completion of three months of service unless such withdrawal is determined to be for good cause.

SEC. 3. (a) The activities of the Junior Army shall, so far as practicable, be conducted in a manner which will not interfere with the education or attendance at school or normal home life of junior soldiers; and no junior soldier shall be assigned to any service which necessitates his absence from school or from his place of residence, unless he volunteers for such service with the consent of his parent or guardian.

(b) Junior soldiers shall not be paid compensation by the United States. In cases where they perform services for other persons, organizations, or agencies, the terms and conditions upon which such services are performed, and the com-

pensation to be paid therefor, shall be determined and fixed in accordance with regulations of the Secretary.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this act, the Secretary—

(a) May enter into agreements with public and private agencies and, pursuant to such agreements, may utilize the facilities and services of such agencies, may reimburse them on a cost basis for the use of such facilities and services, and may delegate to them the performance of functions under this Act.

(b) May accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services.

(c) May utilize such personnel and facilities of the Department of Agriculture, employ such additional personnel, and make such expenditures as may be necessary.

(d) Shall make such rules and regulations as are necessary for the establishment and operation of the Junior Army in order to accomplish the purposes of this Act, including rules and regulations relating to the establishment, composition, organization, and operation of units thereof.

SEC. 5. The heads of the several departments and agencies of the Government are authorized, upon request of the Secretary, to detail civilian or military personnel of their respective departments or agencies to assist the Secretary in the administration of this Act and in the establishment and supervision of the Junior Army, and such detail shall be considered part of the official duties of such personnel.

SEC. 6. The Junior Army shall not be considered, for the purposes of any other law, to be a part of the military or naval forces of the United States.

SEC. 7. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 8. The provisions of this Act shall cease to be in effect at the end of six months after the termination of the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or at such earlier time as the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate.

SEC. 9. This Act may be cited as the "Junior Army Act."

IMPORTANCE OF GIVING RANK AND INSIGNIA TO MEMBERS OF JUNIOR ARMY

The whole thought of that was that you could give these boys and girls a rank. For instance, if they had a regiment in Baltimore, make somebody a colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, and have lieutenants, and so on, and give them some sort of insignia. There is a certain amount of war psychology which would tend to recruit them into such an organization. What I am thinking is if you attempt to do this without the psychological factors included, you will not get the response you will have if you allow them to have some rank and have them feel they are part of this great big military project.

I have briefly outlined the proposal, and I don't want a yes-or-no answer, but I would appreciate it if you would consider it.

Senator OVERTON. May I interrupt? I would like to say I think that is the finest suggestion yet made.

PROVISION IN BUDGET ESTIMATE FOR VICTORY FARM VOLUNTEERS

Senator RUSSELL. I notice in the break-down of the Budget estimate that provision is made for the "Victory Farm Volunteers," which is a different name, but the proposal is apparently along the same line as Senator Tydings' bill.

Senator TYDINGS. That, however, doesn't give them ranks. I think you have to put these kids in a uniform, or give them a hat, or some insignia.

WOMEN'S LAND ARMY

Senator RUSSELL. There is also proposed in the Budget estimate a women's land army; so you have the two appeals—to the high-school students, and the women.

Secretary WICKARD. We expect to use older girls and younger boys and girls, from 14 to 18. I don't know whether it is possible or not.

IMPORTANCE OF USE OF AN APPROPRIATE INSIGNIA

Senator TYDINGS. There would be restrictions and obstacles you would run into. But in my humble judgment, looking back on my own boyhood, if we could have gotten some sort of certificate or insignia in some organization—not being able to get into the war—we would certainly have joined it.

Senator RUSSELL. I think it is a splendid idea. I think the idea of a hat or the insignia would carry more weight and help more than anything else.

Senator NYE. Mr. Secretary, the door is not closed to your adopting something of that kind?

Secretary WICKARD. No; we have done a number of those things in this field. But, as far as I know, in any State, we have not yet provided for an organization such as this. There is undoubtedly going to be a lot of this which we will provide.

Senator TYDINGS. Why not authorize it formally?

CLOSING OF SCHOOLS TO PERMIT USE OF BOYS AND GIRLS IN FARM WORK

Secretary WICKARD. It would have a little more attractiveness if done on a national scale rather than on a local scale. One thing we have done is this: A few weeks ago I wired all the Governors in the States, asking that they make arrangements to close the schools, whenever it was necessary to plant, cultivate, or harvest a crop, so far as their own laws or regulations would permit.

IMPORTANCE OF APPROPRIATE INSIGNIA AND RANK

Senator TYDINGS. If I might interpose there, you have this obstacle. If you get those boys and girls out picking tomatoes or cotton or anything like that all day, it is hard work. If you get them out 2 or 3 days, unless there is a semblance of discipline, and unless they are going to get this rank and this recognition, a lot of them I think will drop out. But with the rank and the insignia, the pride the boy will have in his rank and the organization will cause him to show up the following morning. I don't think you will get the results, without having the psychological factor, and unless you instill this feeling of pride in his work.

Senator HOLMAN. They should have a slogan—such as "Food will win the war." Furthermore, there must be dignity and vitality to the movement.

Senator TYDINGS. It is voluntary; you don't draft anyone.

PLANS FOR VOLUNTARY FARM-WORKER MOVEMENT

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, has anyone drawn any plans for this voluntary farm-worker movement?

Mr. WILSON. A great deal of thought has been given to that, Senator. We estimate between five and six hundred thousand high-school boys and girls in the country could be working on the farms, and we have thought there would be two different types and classes. There

would be one type, Senator, that would follow pretty much the plan you have outlined. We hadn't thought of the military organization; but we had worked out an insignia and an arm band, and a certificate of service.

Senator TYDINGS. Why not give them the rank, and let them be colonels and captains and lieutenants and sergeants and first-class privates?

Mr. WILSON. That might be done.

Senator TYDINGS. You have a lot of people here not fighting the war who are colonels and generals. I don't see why these kids, in the biggest war industry in America, the farm, shouldn't have some recognition.

Mr. WILSON. Those high-school boys and girls would be of two types, one going out and working in the surrounding area, and another type which would be a camp type. So that instead of going out as Boy Scouts and having a camp in the mountains, say their camp would be adjacent to the tomato fields and they would perform this work instead.

In your State, Senator, a number of very successful experiments were carried out last year, where the youngsters went out and lived in a rural high school, in which there was a cafeteria and arrangements for sleeping could be worked out.

Secretry WICKARD. And give the 4-H boys and girls the same recognition.

Senator TYDINGS. You can put them in. But I tell you, when summertime comes and it is hot, and the old swimming hole is down on the river or the bay, unless there is some psychological urge to keep them at work, that swimming hole looks pretty good when it is hot.

Mr. WILSON. A great deal of this was considered last year, and the plan the Secretary presented provides for a cooperative arrangement between the Extension Service and the schools, for the complete mobilization of the students.

Senator TYDINGS. Will you criticize this bill and see how we can fix it up, along the lines suggested?

Mr. WILSON. I will be glad to do it.

Senator RUSSELL. How complete are your plans, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. We have worked out a memorandum, with the Office of Education, which is very brief.

Senator RUSSELL. I wish you would submit that to us to have it printed in the record. Also, I would like for you to have someone make a comparison, as expeditiously as possible, of Senator Tydings' plan and the one you have already formulated, and submit that in the morning.

Mr. WILSON. I will be glad to.

(The information requested is as follows:)

THE VICTORY FARM VOLUNTEERS PROGRAM FOR UTILIZING IN-SCHOOL NONFARM YOUTH OR PRODUCTIVE FARM WORK, AND FOR PROVIDING SUCH YOUTH WITH AN EDUCATIVE WORK EXPERIENCE

Statement of the Responsibilities of the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency and of the War Manpower Commission and the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture

THE SITUATION

Agricultural production is becoming more and more vital to the war effort. The production of the necessary food and fiber supplies must be maintained and even extended in the face of lessened manpower on farms. Under these circumstances, it becomes imperative to make the most effective use possible of the labor now on farms, and to draw upon all available supplemental labor capable of contributing in any appreciable way to agricultural production.

Experience during the 1942 crop season has clearly demonstrated that nonfarm youth of high school and college age can, with proper selection, training, placement, and supervision, make a worth-while, practical contribution to the farm labor supply. It is now proposed to conduct an organized Nation-wide program to ultilize nonfarm youth of both sexes for farm work during the summer and other emergency periods throughout the crop season.

Because of the functions each is performing in the general social structure of the Nation, the Federal agencies involved in this statement have definite, clear-cut duties, each of which must be discharged with great skill, and in proper relationship to the program as a whole.

The functions of selecting in-school nonfarm youth, and providing suitable training, naturally rest with the Office of Education and the public school system.

The selection of farms, the placement of the youth and the supervision of the farmer-worker relationship involved in the program can be handled best by the Cooperative Extension Service.

The brief outline of the program which follows will serve as a general pattern for the coordinated operation of the program on all levels—Federal, State, and local. It is clearly recognized that the general pattern of coooperative relationship between the respective units of the agencies involved will need to be modified in many instances to fit field conditions.

I. General description of program.

(*a*) *Name.*—Victory Farm Volunteers.

(*b*) *Purposes.*—The purposes of the program are:

1. To mobilize for essential farm work during the war-emergency period a large number of able-bodied school youth located in cities, towns, and villages.

2. To provide valuable training and experience in farm work.

(*c*) *Scope.*—It is expected that the program will be extended to include not less than 500,000 nonfarm youth in 1943. Of this number, it is estimated that approximately one-half will live in farm homes, or in camps located in farming areas, for a continuous period of from 1 to 4 months.

The remaining half will continue to live at home while employed at farm work. It is probable that many of this latter number will work only for critical periods of relatively short duration.

(*d*) *Agencies involved.*—The proposed program will be carried out under the joint auspices and direction of the Extension Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the U. S. Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency and of the War Manpower Commission.

II. General Premises on which the program is based.

(*a*) *Relation to high school.*—This program is recommended for all secondary schools;[1] public, parochial, and private. It should be stressed as one of the important activities of the High School Victory Corps.

(*b*) *Relation to Manpower program.*—The program is to be regarded as only one part of the farm labor mobilization program that must be carried on by the Federal Government which is, in turn, a part of an over-all manpower program, and must be integrated at all levels with other efforts in the larger program to mobilize labor for warm work.

(*c*) *Relation to other available labor.*—The use of nonfarm youth in farm work is to be regarded as supplementary to the use of experienced farm labor where available.

(*d*) *Relation to local effort.*—It is anticipated that in localities where the labor of nonfarm youth is utilized there will be a plan for the selection, placement, and follow-up of such young workers. In the development of the local

[1] The reference to secondary schools is not intended to exclude colleges from participating in the Victory Farm Volunteers program.

plan, representatives of the Extension Service and the public schools will participate, as well as representatives of other agencies and organizations.

(*e*) *Relation to existing laws, regulations, and standards.*—The program in each State will be in conformity to existing Federal and State laws, regulations, and standards governing the employment of youth.

(*f*) *Relation to private youth organizations.*—Private agencies conducting summer camps or other farm work camps will be invited to cooperate.

III. Determination of need.

The Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture and the State agricultural colleges will be primarily responsible for determining the need for utilizing nonfarm school youth for agricultural employment. Determination of the need will be made in cooperation with other agencies and with full consideration of the total labor supply. Early determination of apparent need and probable demand is basic to the effective operation of this program. Such information should be supplied to the school authorities at the earliest possible time.

IV. Description of procedures and division of responsibility.

(*a*) *Recruitment and selection.*—School authorities will have the responsibility for presenting to students the emergency farm labor problem, the plan for their participation in this program and the advantages of such participation. In large cities, recruitment will be largely for farm work outside the service area of the school. In smaller cities, recruitment will be, for the most part, for farm employment within the high-school service area.

The responsibility for presentation and recruitment will belong to the school administration. It will also be their responsibility to explain this matter to parents and to secure their approval and cooperation.

During the recruiting period, each prospective farm worker will be interviewed in order to secure necessary information and to make certain that the students understand the program. As a result of these interviews, some students may be eliminated. Further eliminations may be made during the training period, depending upon sustained interest, ability, and probability of employment.

It is recommended that the faculty member responsible for the program consult with the representatives of the Extension Service in regard to this preliminary selection.

(*b*) *Training nonfarm high-school students for wartime farm work*—The United States Office of Education and the State departments of education will be primarily responsible for the training program. The two objectives of the training program. The two objectives of the training program will be:

1. Familiarize nonfarm young people with rural and farm life, and
2. Provide training in specific farm skills.

As many of these activities as possible should be conducted on farms or in real situations.

The prospective young workers, wherever possible, should ascertain in what communities and for what farmers they desire to work. The school will solicit the help of the Extension Service in this matter.

The faculty member responsible for the program in a given high school will mobilize the teaching facilities of the community, bringing before the prospective workers such persons as farmers, county agents, nearby vocational agricultural teachers, farm labor specialists of the United States Employment Service, representatives of the State agricultural college, representatives of farm organizations, and others. Local facilities such as public markets, milk plants, fruit storage plants, and the like will be utilized.

On-the-job group training of youth is desirable in some instances. Wherever possible, this group training will be given by the teacher of vocational agriculture or other approved person. It is recognized that on-the-job individual training will be the responsibility primarily of the farmer-employer.

(*c*) *Informing farmers and sectional farms.*—Responsibility for acquainting farmers with the Victory Farm Volunteers program in areas where the local regular farm labor supply is inadequate and where nonfarm youth might make a worth-while labor contribution rests primarily with the Extension Service. The county extension agent or temporary farm labor assistant shall approve all applications for youth labor under the Victory Farm Volunteer plan.

Because many farmers will be employing nonfarm youth for the first time, it is exceedingly important that the necessary steps be taken to insure complete understanding by farmers of the conditions of employment and what should and should not be expected from youth inexperienced in farm work.

It is the responsibility of the Extension Service to see that the farms from which applications for youth labor under this program are accepted, and the camps where the youth will live, meet agreed-upon standards.

It is expected that representatives of the public schools will share with the Extension Service and farm leaders the responsibility for outlining minimum standards for farm homes and camps suitable for the placement of nonfarm youth, and for establishing acceptable conditions of employment.

(*d*) *Placement.*—The Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture shall have primary responsibility for the placement of nonfarm youth participating in the program. Efforts of cooperating agencies, which may result in the placement of such youth, shall be channeled through the Extension Service, where youth activity records will be compiled and analyzed in consideration of the local labor supply and demand.

School authorities will have detailed student training records which will guide them in assistiug the Extension Service in making applicant selections. The Extension Service should utilize fully these sources of applicant information in meeting requests for student farm workers.

(*e*) *Working conditions and wages.*—The principles recommended by the "Conference ou Supervision and Employmeut Conditions for Young Workers in Wartime Agriculture," June 18–19, 1942, should, until superseded, be used as a general guide in establishing working conditions and wages for nonfarm youth.

It shall be the responsibility primarily of State and local committees organized to establish geueral plans and policies for the operation of the Victory Farm Volunteers program, to formulate local standards of working conditions and to agree upon a suggested schedule of wages and hours governing the employment of school workers, giving due consideration to prevailing local practices and to the character and amouut of farm labor that the nonfarm school youth are able to perform.

In the event that a public agency is designated to establish minimum rates of wages and hours for all farm labor, the above mentioned schedule of wages and hours should be presented to that agency as a recommendation covering the employment of nonfarm school youth in the locality.

(*f*) *Transportation, housing, and insurance.*—The expenses of transporting school workers to farms for seasonal work under this program should, as a rule, be defrayed by the workers themselves or by the employing farmers.

It shall be the responsibility primarily of the Extension Service to see that arrangements are made for this transportation in the most feasible manner. In certain instances, the Farm Security Administration may be in a position to provide trausportation for school workers. The services and facilities of local citizens, groups, and institutions may also be enlisted.

Where youth live away from home, housing facilities will be provided by the employing farmers in all cases except where work camps are established for groups by civic or youth organizations or where regular labor supply centers are established by the Farm Security Administration. It shall be the responsibility of the Extension Service to see that housing facilities provided in farm homes or in work camps are adequate and in line with generally accepted housing and sanitation standards for the area.

Where the State program calls for employee liability or other insurance, the cost of such insurance shall be met by the farmer-employer.

(*g*) *Supervision of farmer-worker relationships.*—It shall be the responsibility of the Extension Service to keep in constant touch with the youth workers and farmer employers to adjust misunderstandings, assist farmers with on-the-job training, help youth adjust themselves to farm life, assure their participation in community social and recreational activities, and arrange for shifting workers where such change seems desirable. It shall be the goal of supervision to make certain that nonfarm youth are not exploited and that farmers receive a reasonable return for the wage paid.

It is anticipated that a full-time supervisor for the Victory Farm Volunteers project will be employed for a 6-month period in all counties having 75 or more nonfarm youth workers living in farm homes. Where the number of such workers is less than 75 but more than 25, a part-time supervisor will employed. Regular extension agents will arrange for adequate supervision of the activity in counties where fewer than 25 such nonfarm youth are placed.

V. Suggested organization for effective coordination.

Each of the agencies involved in this program will be responsible for the execution of its respective functions, operating under its own legislative authority and

through its own regional, State, and local organizational units. However, definite provision for adequate coordination on all levels is absolutely essential to the orderly promotion and effective operation of the Victory Farm Volunteers plan of using nonfarm youth in wartime agricultural production.

(*a*) The national committee shall be composed of one representative and one alternate from each of the following agencies: (1) Office of Education and (2) Extension Service. The functions of the committee shall be:

1. To review and approve broad operational plans, policies, and publications pertaining to this program.
2. Make recommendations regarding State and local plans of organization.

(*b*) State committees for this program should include one representative from at least each of the following: (1) State department of education, and (2) extension service. It is desirable that such a representative group function as a subcommittee of any existing State committee concerned with the total farm-labor problem.

Some of the functions of this committee should be: (1) Initiate State program based on suggestions of national committee, (2) coordinate the Victory Farm Volunteers program with other State programs concerned with the farm labor supply and demand, (3) review and approve broad operational plans, policies, and publications originating at the State level, and (4) render active assistance to county or local committees.

(*c*) County or local committees for this program should include representation from at least the following agencies: (1) The public schools, and (2) the county extension service.

Some of the functions of this committee should be: (1) Initiate county or local programs, (2) coordinate the Victory Farm Volunteers program with other county or local programs concerned with the farm labor supply and demand, and (3) render active assistance in the local execution of the program.

(*d*) Cooperation with other agencies and organizations: The active cooperation of public agencies, farm organizations, youth groups, and civic bodies is essential to the attainment of the objectives of the Victory Farm Volunteers program; i. e., maximum contribution to national food production and a satisfying work experience. It is suggested that selected representatives of important agencies and organizations interested in youth be requested to serve as advisory members of the National, State, and county or local committees established to facilitate the planning and execution of the Victory Farm Volunteers program.

VI. Evaluation of procedures and accomplishment.

The responsibility for the evaluation of the Victory Farm Volunteers rests jointly with the Extension Service and the Office of Education. The size of the Victory Farm Volunteers program and its impact upon future programs necessitate a careful evaluation to determine its success and to discover the conditions associated with unsatisfactory results.

W. T. Spanton,
Chief, Agricultural Education Service,
United States Office of Education.
M. L. Wilson,
Director of Extension Work,
United States Department of Agriculture.

Approved:

J. O. Walker,
Chief, Agricultural Labor Branch,
Food Production Administration,
United States Department of Agriculture.
J. W. Studebaker,
Commissioner of Education,
Federal Security Agency and War Manpower Commission.

February 3, 1943.

Contrasting the Junior Army and the Victory Farm Volunteers

[See p. 25]

In many respects the Junior Army program is similar to the Victory Farm Volunteers program which was planned cooperatively during the past 4 months by representatives of the Federal Extension Service and Office of Education. The basis of cooperation was set forth in the joint statement of responsibilities, a copy of which is enclosed.

The plans for the Victory Farm Volunteers program included careful selection and preparation of the young people for farm work and the placement and supervision on the farm. Training materials have been prepared for the volunteers, the school advisers, and the supervisors. A leaflet has also been prepared for the farmers who will have youth on their farms for the season. The Children's Bureau has prepared a pamphlet for the Victor Farm Volunteers program on the employment of nonfarm youth in wartime agriculture. Planning for the Victory Farm Volunteers program is well under way and is awaiting the green light.

The major differences between the Junior Army and the Victory Farm Volunteers are the purpose and the organization. The Junior Army includes other war service work besides production, harvesting, and distribution of agricultural commodities. It is similar to the Boys Working Reserve of the last war. The Victory Farm Volunteers is limited to relieving the farm labor shortage.

The Junior Army contemplates an army organiaztion with ranks according to those in the Army of the United States from private to colonel, depending upon qualifications and duties. The Victory Farm Volunteers is not highly organized with ranking grades. It is flexible to fit local conditions for the maximum use of nonfarm youth to relieve the farm labor shortage. As such the Victory Farm Volunteers program is part of the Emergency Farm Labor program, the United States Crop Corps, and the High School Victory Corps of the Office of Education.

The two programs are further contrasted below:

JUNIOR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES	VICTORY FARM VOLUNTEERS PROGRAM
1. Direction of the program: Department of Agriculture.	1. Direction of program: Extension Service, Department of Agriculture.
2. Boys and girls.	2. Same.
3. Age: "Between ages of 14 and 18 years."	3. Age: Boys, 14 to 17 years, inclusive; girls, 14 years and older.
4. Recruitment: Voluntary.	4. Same.
5. Purpose: Production, harvesting, and distribution of agricultural commodities. Performance of other useful work or activities in which they are qualified to render service which will contribute to the effective prosecution of the war. (This last paragraph is similar to the Boys' Working Reserve of the last war and different from the Victory Farm Volunteers.)	5. Purpose: Production and harvesting of agricultural commodities. Girls to work in farm homes to release experienced labor for the fields.
6. Selection of qualified applicants.	6. Same.
7. Written consent of parent or guardian.	7. Same.
8. Period of service: 3 months.	8. No definite period of service determined. But suggested period of 1 month's work to obtain certificate of accomplishment.
9. Organization: Army organization with ranks according to those in the army of the United States from private to colonel, depending upon qualifications and duties.	9. Organization: Part of the Emergency Farm Labor Program. Victory Farm Volunteers may or may not be members of the High School Victory Corps. No ranking grades. Part of the United States Crop Corps.
10. Insignia: Provision of caps or hats and buttons or pins by the Secretary of Agriculture for indicating membership and rank in the junior army. Certificate of honorable discharge for those working 3 months.	10. Insignia: Insignia contemplated. Cards of appointment and certificate of accomplishment.
11. School attendance: If he volunteers with the consent of his parents he may be absent from school.	11. School attendance: Absence from school for farm work will depend upon State laws.
12. Pay: Paid by the employers, in accordance with regulations determined for service by the Secretary of Agriculture. Not paid by the United States of America.	12. Same.
13. Other agencies: May enter into agreement with public or private agency; utilize their service and facilities and reimburse them on a cost basis and may delegate to them the performance of certain functions. Detail of civilian or military personnel of Government agencies to assist the Secretary in the administration of the act.	13. Other agencies: The Victory Farm Volunteers' program includes the cooperation of other Government agencies and private organizations. These organizations have participated in the planning and plan to participate under the program to relieve the farm labor shortage.
14. Not a part of the military or naval forces of the United States.	14. Same.

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF WOMEN FOR FARM WORK

Mr. WILSON. We have assumed there would probably be 10,000 women who would work on farms, at the particular work they could do, on a year-round basis, and about 50,000 women who would do seasonal work. We think there are a great many women in the towns and cities who will participate. We think right here in Washington and in the suburbs of Washington there would be groups of women organized who would volunteer to go over and work in the canning factories of Maryland.

Senator TYDINGS. In my own neighborhood they would put up three or four hundred thousand cases of corn. They haven't the labor. Unless you can recruit the labor you won't get all that corn. That runs into millions of cans.

WAGES TO BE PAID VOLUNTEER FARM WORKERS

Senator MCCARRAN. What is your idea of the wages to be paid these workers?

Mr. WILSON. We think on a piecework basis it is very simple, and that where it isn't on a piecework basis, then it has to be adjusted out in the community. But we think it can be adjusted all right, because most of these people volunteering for this service are actuated by patriotic motives, and to make their contribution to the food supply, and we don't think a few cents' difference in pay will have any material effect.

Senator MCCARRAN. Of course, that is a Utopian way of looking at it; but we find it a little different on the practical side. I have in mind, and I know you must have in mind, our experience in the West and in the Southwest when we brought in Mexican labor. We were confronted with conditions there that made it almost prohibitive to bring it in, under the conditions under which they would be brought in, that there had to be every kind of a facility known to the modern world, in order to meet the demands, together with the standard of wages.

Mr. WILSON. But that, Senator, is a different type of labor than this voluntary labor. That is a different type than we are talking about. And we think about a million and a quarter of the people living in the towns and villages—the local hardware merchant and the minister, or whoever they are—when this peak load is on they are going to be willing this year to go out and help wherever they can. And I don't think, Senator, there will be much difficulty about the wages.

Senator RUSSELL. Senator Lodge has some questions.

Senator LODGE. I would like to get some information for myself and also for the record, first on the total extent of this problem.

DECREASE IN FARM WORKERS AS COMPARED TO A YEAR AGO

I notice on page 3 of the House hearings you make the statement, Mr. Secretary, there are 200,000 less workers on the farms today than a year ago. Is that correct?

Secretary WICKARD. That is substantially correct.

Senator LODGE. Will this program embodied in this joint resolution enable you to meet the gaps that have been caused by that shortage?

Secretary WICKARD. The 200,000 indicated there are the all-year-round workers, because those figures, I think, were taken from the January report.

Senator LODGE. That was February 17.

Secretary WICKARD. From the January report, then.

Senator BANKHEAD. Those figures are nearly 4,000,000 less than your peak during the year.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; but 200,000 less than the number on the farms during that period of the year.

Senator LODGE. For the corresponding period?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; that is right.

Senator LODGE. Because there is an expansion and contraction of some three million or so every year?

Secretary WICKARD. Seasonally; that is right.

MEANS BY WHICH SHORTAGE IN ALL-YEAR-ROUND WORKERS WILL BE CORRECTED

Senator LODGE. How are you going to make up that shortage of 200,000?

Secretary WICKARD. Well, first we hope there will be considerable back-to-the-farm movement from cities and industries; for instance, the gasoline filling station operators are going back. We have had a great number of reports of people going back to the farm, who were formerly engaged in agriculture and who are experienced in agriculture. And we hope we can get from some surplus areas some people whose labor is not being fully utilized now, so that we will make better use of the people we have.

Senator LODGE. Would you say you would get about a hundred thousand that way?

Secretary WICKARD. I would say perhaps that would be a reasonable figure. We are not going to get as many as we would like to have, of course.

Senator LODGE. Then the remaining hundred thousand you would get from recruiting of voluntary workers—and how would you make up the whole thing?

Secretary WICKARD. Of the 200,000?

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Secretary WICKARD. Well, as I just mentioned, out of people returning to agriculture, and the people in agriculture who are not being fully employed. And then we will have to rely upon older people, on many who perhaps thought they had retired some years ago, who had worked on the farm and who won't be able to do perhaps as much as a younger person, but who can make a contribution.

Senator LODGE. Do you think you can do that?

Secretary WICKARD. I'm not sure we can get the 200,000 we ought to have.

REPLACEMENT OF KEY MEN ON THE FARM

Senator RUSSELL. My observation has been that where you pull out a key man, it takes about two or three people to take his place. What do you say about that?

Secretary WICKARD. I have testified before various committees, and you people here have heard me say, we have already taken too many of the skilled type of worker from the farms, the people who have lived on the farms.

Senator LODGE. That is my next question.

Secretary WICKARD. And I have been trying to get that movement stopped, the movement away from the farm and into industry and the armed services, for a couple of years. It is now somewhat a case of locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen; but we have to do the best we can. I am not too optimistic, and when Senator Holman asked me the question "Where can I get a man to run a dairy farm?" I don't have that answer.

Senator LODGE. Do you think we can get half of them?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; I think we can get half of them.

NUMBER OF MIGRATORY WORKERS IN PROGRAM

Senator LODGE. How many do you plan to move from one place to another?

Secretary WICKARD. Is it 350,000? Is that what we planned on?

Mr. DARROW. Yes, Mr. Secretary; we want to be prepared to move that many, if necessary. No one knows how many, exactly, it will be.

Senator LODGE. But you don't anticipate having to get that many, do you?

Mr. DARROW. It all depends on how many we get from Mexico, the Bahamas, and from other areas, as well as the number of people who formerly went from one place to another and who don't have the gasoline and the rubber and who will have to be dependent upon some other method of transportation. How many of these people are going to be available, we don't know. We know every year they start in at Florida and come up the eastern seaboard and finally get up to New York State, and then drift back. They used to do that in their own cars. Those are the people for whom we will have to provide some sort of transportation, if they are still available. They include not only the man who works, but the mother and older children who work, as well. We have provided camps for many of them in the past.

EFFECT OF DEMAND FOR WORKERS IN INDUSTRY UPON SUPPLY OF MIGRANT FARM WORKERS

Senator BANKHEAD. Mr. Secretary, how do you figure many of those who previously were migrants getting just a bare subsistence are going to continue that sort of work, when employers are advertising everywhere for workers?

Secretary WICKARD. It is a great question how many are still left.

Senator BANKHEAD. And when they are willing to pay them four or five times the wages the migrant gets if he continues as a migrant? Do you think you are going to have very many of them?

Secretary WICKARD. Not nearly as many as there have been. That is one reason we will have to bring Bahamans into Florida, because the people ordinarily there are not there now.

Senator LODGE. You have had some experience already in moving farm workers, haven't you? You have had about a year's experience in that?

Secretary WICKARD. We have been engaging in some program of migratory labor for quite a while.

Senator LODGE. When you approach a man and offer him transportation to the scene of the work, and a proper wage and proper living conditions when he gets there, and return home, do you find he will take it and do the work? Or, once you have found them, do you have trouble persuading them?

Secretary WICKARD. No; I don't think we do.

DIFFICULTY IN FINDING MIGRANT WORKERS

Senator LODGE. Your difficulty is in finding them?

Secretary WICKARD. That is right.

Senator LODGE. Your difficulty is in not knowing who they are and where they are?

Secretary WICKARD. That is right.

Senator LODGE. That is the real problem, is it not?

Secretary WICKARD. That is correct.

WORKERS ENGAGED ON CROPS NOT OF FIRST NECESSITY IN WARTIME

Senator LODGE. I have been told, as many of us have, that there are large numbers of agriculturists engaged in producing agricultural products which are not of the first necessity in wartime; that they are engaged in producing crops large quantities of which we already have stored; for example, that we have a year's supply of certain products, but still a large number of people are engaged in the production of those products. What have you to say on that?

Secretary WICKARD. I think the number of people engaged in that are very small. There are a number of crops, such as cucumbers and watermelons, which are not essential; but I consider cotton an essential crop, because of the cottonseed and the cotton oil and the cake and the hulls, all of which are very badly needed. And the linters, you know, are used for explosives. All of those items are very short.

SUPPLY OF COTTON

Senator LODGE. Haven't we a year's supply of short-staple cotton?

Secretary WICKARD. I should think we have about a year's supply, altogether.

Senator LODGE. And yet you think we should go on and produce these large quantities?

ORDER ISSUED PERMITTING COTTON FARMERS TO PLANT 10 PERCENT MORE THAN LAST YEAR'S ALLOTMENT

Secretary WICKARD. Recently, as you know, I issued an order permitting farmers to plant 10 percent more than their allotment for last year.

Senator BANKHEAD. And last year they planted 10 percent less than their allotment; so that you have a tolerance not of 10 percent but of 20 percent.

Secretary WICKARD. But they probably won't plant the 20 percent more, because they will plant other crops.

Senator BANKHEAD. But it is permissible.

FARMERS ALSO PLANTING PEANUTS, SOYBEANS, AND OTHER CROPS

Secretary WICKARD. It is. But, first of all, those participating must plant their war crops—peanuts, soybeans, or whatever it may be. Then if they have the land, they may go 10 percent over their allotment the previous year. So I don't think we will have anything like or near the 20 percent increase over what we had last year. But in those areas where they do have the land and the labor and where they can produce short staple, we know very well we are going to be able to use the cottonseed and the oil and the cake and the hulls and the linters. And I can talk to you about wheat.

SUPPLY OF WHEAT

Senator LODGE. You have a year's supply of wheat, haven't you?

Secretary WICKARD. We have more than a year's supply of wheat at the present time. But I think the time is coming when we will have to use wheat for alcohol and for feed, as approved by the Senate recently, and we are not going to have too much wheat. I am looking on the reserves of wheat in this country as a blessing. And you can only produce certain things in certain areas.

QUESTION OF ADVISABILITY OF UTILIZING WHEAT FARMS FOR PRODUCTION OF MORE ESSENTIAL FOODS

Senator LODGE. And you could move them off to produce something more essential.

Secretary WICKARD. I don't know that I have the power to do that.

Senator LODGE. But if you had the power, you could do it?

Secretary WICKARD. And I don't know how that would work out, with the large equipment they use.

SUCCESS OF EFFORTS TO GET WORKERS IN INDUSTRY TO RETURN TO FARMS

Senator LODGE. What progress are you making, if any, in getting people from industry to return to the farm, those now in industry?

Secretary WICKARD. Recently there have been quite a few reports coming to us that the people are returning from industry to farming. I think some of the action taken by the Manpower Commission has brought that about.

Senator BANKHEAD. And it may also be due to the announcement of deferment for them?

Secretary WICKARD. That is right. There have been some people going back to the farms from industry.

Senator LODGE. Because they don't want to go into the Army, they are returning to the farm?

Secretary WICKARD. Some of them are older men, and they are learning the Government is anxious for them to go back to the farms.

SWING IS BACK TO THE FARM

Senator LODGE. The movement has stopped, would you say, away from the farm, and it has started to move back, to some extent at least?

Secretary WICKARD. I think that is a very good statement. I don't know that it has stopped; but the swing the other way has started.

Senator LODGE. What is being done under the A. A. A. at the present time? Are you still seeking to keep agricultural production down?

Secretary WICKARD. I have just told you about the action on cotton. There is no restriction on wheat or corn or any other food crops, after the farmer plants these acreages of the essential crops like I described, such as tomatoes and potatoes.

USE OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION FUNDS TO PROMOTE DIVERSIFICATION OF CROPS

Senator LODGE. Are you using the A. A. A. money to make them diversify?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir; that is what we are doing.

Senator BANKHEAD. To get the things you need the most?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

Senator LODGE. And not keep down the volume of production, which was the intent of the law?

Secretary WICKARD. That is one of the things stated. But the law, if you read it, devotes a lot of expression to the most economical and the best use of land. And I think what we are doing carries out that objective, because at the present time we do need peanuts, soybeans, potatoes, beans, and flax, and all these other crops. The funds and the organization are being used for that purpose, plus a lot of other things.

WORK BEING DONE BY TRIPLE A

You asked what the triple A people are doing. They are rationing farm machinery and fertilizer, working with the selective service boards; and also, at the present time, we are going to have a control or licensing of all livestock sales and slaughtering, and they will help us to get that started. There are a lot of additional wartime duties given to these committees selected by the farmers themselves.

Senator LODGE. Can you tell me why this proposition is made to the Appropriation Committees rather than to a legislative committee?

Secretary WICKARD. I have no knowledge of that.

Senator LODGE. I am almost finished now. You have been very forthright and responsive, and I appreciate it. This next is a matter to which I don't want to have your reply now, but I would like to have you send your reply to me at your convenience. There is an article by Mr. Bill Cunningham, of the Boston Herald, regarding a Department of Agriculture directive which he says will remove free enterprise from the national wool industry. It comes, oddly enough, as a part of the food-rationing program. I wish you would take this article and read it and send me your response to it.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

STEPS TAKEN TO REQUIRE MAINTENANCE OF SUBSISTENCE FARMS IN ADDITION TO STAPLE CROPS

Senator OVERTON. Mr. Secretary, I find they have staple crops planted in Louisiana and other States to conserve the soil, but around the house there is no vegetable garden and some of them have no chickens and some no hogs. They are not doing anything toward having a subsistence farm off of which they can live, but go to town and buy those things. They go to town and buy eggs and meat and other necessities. Have you given any thought as to what could be done to require the farmer to have a garden and have hogs and cows and milk for the children, and chickens?

Secretary WICKARD. As you know, Senator, the Department of Agriculture has sponsored what has been known as a live-at-home program for a number of years. We have succeeded more in putting that sort of program in effect in the last few years than we have been able to bring about in a decade or two of work of this kind.

VICTORY GARDEN PROGRAM

This year we are sponsoring a program known as the victory garden program, hoping it will get a garden on each farm in this country, as well as in the cities.

Senator OVERTON. That is voluntary?

PAYMENTS MADE AS REWARD FOR PRODUCING GARDENS

Secretary WICKARD. That is voluntary. We did at one time pay a small payment as a reward to people who produced a garden.

Do we still have that program?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Yes, sir.

Under the 1943 agricultural conservation program a production practice allowance is established for each farm. In general, the allowance is computed on the basis of the size of the farm and is the maximum payment which may be made for carrying out production practices. Among the various production practices approved for payment, the growing of a home garden for a landlord, tenant, or sharecropper family on the farm is included in some parts of the country. The States in which this practice is applicable, together with the rates of payments, are as follows:

	Rates of payment per garden
South Carolina	[1] $5.00
Arkansas	1.50
Florida	2.00
Georgia	1.50
Louisiana	1.50
Oklahoma	3.00
Texas	1.50
North Carolina	1.50
Parts of Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Ohio	3.00
Missouri	3.00

[1] Rate is higher because of larger production requirement.

In 1941, the latest year for which statistics are available, payment was made for growing approximately 630,000 gardens in accordance

with approved specifications. This does not mean that these were the only gardens grown on the farms of the Nation. In some of the States the practice is not approved for payment under the program as gardens are generally kept by farmers in the area, and, in addition, some farmers grew gardens which did not meet the specifications contained in the conservation program.

Secretary WICKARD. We are asking everybody who can to have some chickens, in the cities as well as in the country. Our hatchery business orders, by the way, are now 7 percent above what they were last year, when we broke all records. And you know about the great expansion in hog production. The most difficult thing is to get a cow on each farm, which, after all, is most essential.

Senator OVERTON. That requires some capital outlay?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, and it takes some care and a pasture, and a little water.

ADVISABILITY OF DENYING BENEFIT PAYMENTS TO FARMERS WHO DO NOT LIVE UP TO PROGRAM TO LIVE ON FARM

Senator OVERTON. Have you ever considered outlining a program and recommending that legislation be enacted to the effect that the farmer who does not live up to a reasonable program to live on the farm, will be denied benefit payments?

Secretary WICKARD. In some States in the South they have nearly that type of program now. I don't know how strictly it is enforced.

Senator OVERTON. Of course, Congress gives the benefit payments and Congress could enact such legislation.

Secretary WICKARD. Surely.

Senator OVERTON. Withholding benefit payments from those farmers who do not live up to such a program on the farm.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir; it is a worthy objective.

Senator OVERTON. I wish you would give some consideration to that.

Senator HOLMAN. In harmony with that thought, may I make a remark?

Senator OVERTON. Yes, sir.

COUNTY AGRICULTURAL AGENT HAMPERED BY PAPER WORK

Senator HOLMAN. That program is dependent very largely upon the local county agricultural agent's being able to get out into the field and on the farms to see what is taking place and what is failing to take place. At the present time I am convinced the agricultural agent is bogged down in his office with paper work and questionnaires and hearings and bond drives and every kind of thing. I have a bill in asking for an increase of $20,000,000 a year, for the purpose of relieving the county agricultural agent from this what may be inescapable paper work, although I have a notion that much of the paper work could be just cancelled and we would all be happier.

It would provide that the county agricultural agent can have office assistants who can do this detail, paper work, so that he may get out and perform the functions which he was originally employed to do.

I want to make an earnest plea that your department and each of the other departments—and when the time comes, I will speak to them—go through and see if you cannot now cancel a lot of this paper work, statistics gathering, and data compiling, and just wash it out the window and let it go, and get some work done.

PACE AMENDMENT—CERTIFICATION BY COUNTY AND STATE NECESSARY BEFORE FARM WORKER CAN LEAVE COUNTY OR STATE

Senator HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, there is one other amendment adopted on the floor of the House, that the Secretary mentioned in his general statement, that I would like to inquire about; it is on page 4 [reading]:

Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, or for the transportation of any worker outside the limits of the State where he resides or is working without the prior consent in writing of the Commissioner of Agriculture for such State or other official who performs similar functions for such State.

That contemplates a double check on whether a worker can be moved. The county agricultural agent, in the first instance, must certify that the man's services are not needed in the county. That county agent gets a part of his compensation from the United States, and in that sense he is a Federal official. The second part of this proposal turns over the veto power to the State official who is in no way at all responsible to the Federal Government.

PROVISION TO REQUIRE SUCH CERTIFICATION WILL HAMPER DEPARTMENT

I would like to have your comment on the entire proposal, Mr. Secretary, and on the two sections of it.

Secretary WICKARD. Senator Hayden, I think that would hamper us greatly in endeavoring to get workers to go where they are needed the most. I don't think a county agent would be in a very happy position if he were to say it would be all right to take out 100 workers, or whatever the number might be, out of a certain vegetable producing area, when there were still some vegetables there and, if the weather became bad, there might be some loss. You can see how he later might be criticized severely, although he might have done the practical thing, because the labor was needed more somewhere else than there to clean up the harvest.

I think, also, the State agricultural authority spoken of there is placed in a rather untenable position, because he, being responsible only to the State, would not always feel free to do the practical thing. And, after all, the national program is not his responsibility, but the responsibility of somebody else.

So I would say, to sum up, that I think these two provisions would tend to hamper us in trying fully to utilize our labor supply and take care of the crops that are in the greatest danger.

Senator OVERTON. Of course, the obvious purpose of it is to try to have local labor do the local work, and to vest authority in someone to protect local farms from being despoiled of their labor.

Secretary WICKARD. I don't think, in moving people from one area to another in the past, we have ever taken people when they were needed where they were. It would be a foolish think to do.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, might I ask what effect that would have on taking workers out of the large urban centers? We estimate we may get as many as 60,000 unskilled workers from such places as New York City and Chicago, out on the farms, if needed.

Senator RUSSELL. Before you can move them outside the State, you of course would have to have the consent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture. And, very naturally, if you were going to move them from New York State to New Jersey, to gather vegetables over there, I don't know how this commissioner of agriculture is chosen; but if elected by the people, it occurs to me he would never certify anything letting you take a man out of New York State, if farm labor is short in the State.

Secretary WICKARD. He is either elected by the people or appointed by someone elected by the people.

Senator LODGE. That is true only under this amendment on page 4?

Senator OVERTON. Of course, that could be readily cured by saying "transportation of any farm worker." Under this provision, you couldn't transport any city worker.

Secretary WICKARD. That is very unfortunate, because I don't know how to describe a farm worker—whether it is one now on the farm or one who has been on the farm or one who contemplates being on the farm.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF FEDERAL OFFICE OF EXTENSION

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, I note in the House bill only $100,000 is made available for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of Extension, for carrying out the provisions of the bill, in the transportation of these Mexicans and Bahamans. Is that handled by the Department of Agriculture?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. Would this $100,000 be sufficient to administer the shipment or transportation of large numbers of people?

Secretary WICKARD. No, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. From the Bahamas or from Mexico, into the United States?

Secretary WICKARD. No, sir; it wouldn't permit us to get started, even. We have been operating with funds from the President's emergency fund, and we have obligated a million and a half, I believe, up to the last of January. Now that we are starting to bring in others as well as Mexicans, you can understand $100,000 would be entirely insufficient.

Senator RUSSELL. You couldn't handle their transportation, and the contracts it would be necessary to be drawn for these foreign workers, within any such amount as that?

RESOLUTION AS DRAFTED PROVIDES THAT PART OF FUNDS BE ADMINISTERED BY UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Secretary WICKARD I think it was the intention of the people who drafted the bill passed by the House, that the sum of $12,500,000 would

be turned over to the United States Employment Service for this purpose.

Senator HAYDEN. It reads, on page 3 as follows [reading]:

* * * the remaining funds not to exceed $12,500,000 to be available as provided herein to carry out cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service for recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to State, and imported workers, including the payment of necessary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and protection of such workers while en route, and including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for the importation of workers from Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this Act, * * *.

That is another question that has been disturbing me, whether Congress can prescribe just how to modify an existing agreement between the Government of Mexico and the Government of the United States.

Senator RUSSELL. That is what I had in mind. I knew that provision was in there, and without ample funds to administer any new agreement, if they are going to operate on this scale appropriation. To carry out the provisions of this Bahaman agreement, and the Mexican agreement, there is only $100,000, and really none of it is available to transportation, under the existing agreement.

Secretary WICKARD. It is for administrative purposes.

AMOUNTS USED IN TRANSPORTING DOMESTIC AND MEXICAN WORKERS UP TO FEBRUARY 28

Senator RUSSELL. How much have you been spending a month on the administration of it, handling the Mexican shipments under the existing agreement?

Secretary WICKARD. Can you answer that, Mr. Maycock? From the funds out of the President's emergency fund?

Mr. MAYCOCK. The funds we have obligated include transportation of domestic workers as well as Mexicans. Up to February 28 we had obligated a total of approximately $1.614,000. Of that, $248 000 had been for expenses incurred in connection with the transportation, and $1,366 000 had been for the actual transportation expenses, subsistence en route, and so forth.

Senator RUSSELL. How much has been set up for the handling of the Bahaman agreement? Or has any sum been set up?

Mr. MAYCOCK. No particular amount has been set aside for that purpose.

NUMBER OF WORKERS FROM THE BAHAMAS

Senator RUSSELL. How many people do you think are going to get out of the Bahamas, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary WICKARD. About 6,000, I believe is our latest estimate.

Mr. DARROW. Five thousand, with an outside limit of 6.000—which is about 10 percent of the population of the islands—3,000 males and 2,000 females.

Senator RUSSELL. Have those people hand any farming experience?

Mr. DARROW. Yes, all of them.

(A brief discussion followed off the record.)

NEGOTIATIONS FOR IMPORTED LABOR NOT POSSIBLE WITHOUT ASSURANCES AS TO RATES OF PAY

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, you have had the experience of negotiating this agreement with the Mexican Government and the agreement with the Bahaman Government?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. Do you think it would be possible for you to negotiate any agreement, as is contemplated by the House resolution, if you were not in a position to make any assurances whatever as to the rate of pay they would get?

Secretary WICKARD. I am positive we could not negotiate with any of these foreign governments if we were not in a position to give them assurances about minimum wages and the time they would be allowed to work or given work, and such things as that. I am positive if that House bill becomes law, we are going to be stopped very promptly.

EFFECT OF PROVISIONS OF RESOLUTION ON AGREEMENTS ALREADY ENTERED INTO

Senator RUSSELL. Would it involve the good faith of this country in the agreements already made?

Secretary WICKARD. That is a question. We have several thousand Mexicans here now. I hadn't thought what the consequences would be if this becomes a law. I suppose very probably we would have to send them back.

Senator HAYDEN. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that one approach would be to leave in the measure the language on page 3, which reads:

> * * * the remaining funds not to exceed $12,500,000 to be available as provided herein to carry out cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service for recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to State, and imported workers ,including the payment of necessary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and protection of such workers while en route, * * *—

and then strike out the language that follows [reading]:

> and including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for the importation of workers from Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this Act, * * *.

If we leave that out, we would have there the broad authority to spend $12,500,000 through the Employment Service.

Senator RUSSELL. You would have it to spend through the Employment Service. But the thing disturbing me is, here the Department of Agriculture has already entered into a contract with the Government of Mexico, representing the Government of the United States; and they have entered into an agreement or contract, I assume, with the colonial government of the Bahamas.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. And those contracts have already been signed. But under this language none of this money could be used by the

Department. And the Employment Office would then have to start negotiations with these people to make a contract, if I understand the meaning of this bill.

Secretary WICKARD. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, may I speak off the record?

Senator RUSSELL. Certainly.

(A brief discussion followed, off the record.)

POSSIBILITIES OF USING PAROLED FEDERAL, STATE, AND PRISON LABOR

Senator THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, in that connection I suggest the Department explore the possibilities of using paroled Federal, State, and prison labor, as well as the possibilities of getting interned labor, since we have a number of camps with considerable people in them; also consider the possibility of using regular war prison labor now being brought into this country.

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir.

Senator THOMAS. If we can't get people for this work from other countries, I suggest they consider the use of people already here now, who are suitable for the purpose.

PLANNED USE OF PRISONERS OF WAR AS FARM LABOR

Secretary WICKARD. I think you might tell what plans are being made for using prisoners of war.

Mr. DARROW. We are working with the Army and the War Department on that, to use them were other labor is not available. But the War Department people say it will be very difficult on account of having to send guards along with them, and camp equipment, which is scarce, and so forth; that, as far as possible, they should be used adjacent to where they are quartered. That is in regard to the prisoners of war. We haven't completed those negotiations.

Senator BANKHEAD. We haven't many war prisoners in this country, have we?

Mr. DARROW. Not many yet. There may be a lot more.

Senator BANKHEAD. Where are you going to get them?

Senator THOMAS. A good many are brought in from North Africa.

USE OF JAPANESE AS FARM LABORERS

Mr. DARROW. As to the Japs in the relocation camps, we are ready there with as many as 25,000 who have had some agricultural experience and who will be offered a chance to work on farms. It must be on a voluntary basis, I understand.

Senator RUSSELL. You used some of them last year, didn't you?

Mr. DARROW. Yes. They may go out, Mr. Chairman, as individual farm workers, however, if the farmers will take them, and they may go out in these camps—either way—but they must, of course, stay out of the proscribed areas. I think there is a supply of labor from that source that will help in the sugar beet and other crops in that area. I wish we could use them in that Arizona-California country, where we are so desperately short right now, and speed up the movement of the Mexicans as fast as possible.

REASON WHY JAPANESE CANNOT BE USED IN ARIZONA AND CALIFORNIA

Senator RUSSELL. Why can't you use the Japs down there in Arizona and California?

Mr. DARROW. Because it is in proscribed areas.

Senator HAYDEN. They have created a defense area there extending back some 150 miles from the Pacific and from the Mexican border, into which area the Japs are not permitted to move—which defense zone covers practically all of the cotton-growing area. But the boundary lines of the defense area, as I understand it, may be modified so as to make it possible to obtain some of that labor.

Senator OVERTON. We have quite a number interned in my State, and the suggestion has been made to me by the farmers that they could use that labor right there in Louisiana.

Mr. DARROW. Yes, they could. We have the agreements ready and the procedures worked out.

Senator OVERTON. To utilize that labor?

Mr. DARROW. To utilize it in any of the war relocation centers. It has to be on a voluntary basis. They can't be forced to go out and work, but we are offering them the opportunity.

USE OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Secretary WICKARD. How about conscientious objectors?

Mr. DARROW. There are about 6,500 in all, and others coming in, not so rapidly, though, now. Those workers were to be divided, roughly, between Agriculture and Interior. Agriculture has had more programs going on and has used far more of them than Interior has. Agriculture has now about 4,300 working in 15 S. C. S. camps, and in 17 Forest Service camps. In addition to that, they are used in State institutions quite a little.

USE OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS ON IRRIGATION PROJECT

On the conscientious-objector program, we are just about ready to move today to tell Selective Service, which has this program in charge, with the assistance of the Federation of Churches, that we can vacate so many of these camps where they are not working on food production, and that we want to have so many workers placed in these various categories. The first one we moved on Saturday. That was to clear up one S. C. S. camp of about 150—all of these camps have about that unit, 150 to 160, in them—in order that we might get the workers into Williston, N. Dak., an irrigation project right at the western end of North Dakota and near the eastern border of Montana. There are two irrigation projects there where the water is ready to come on this spring, and the people are ready to move on and farm. The conscientious objectors have been used on one of them in Montana to clear up the land there to be put into cultivation this spring. We need and are getting another camp at Williston, of these conscientious objectors, so that that other project can be taken care of.

84461—43——4

USE OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS WHO ARE EXPERIENCED FARM HANDS

Second, we want to get out of the conscientious objectors all of the experienced farm hands, particularly dairy hands, we can, because, as pointed out earlier here, that is one of the greatest needs. Selective Service has polled the objectors and have found there are about 500 who are experienced like that. So we are moving today to vacate some others, either Forest Service or S. C. S. camps, in order to get those workers on those farms immediately.

TRAINING OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS AS COW TESTERS

Then the cow-testing associations are short of cow testers who have been drafted and taken into the Army. That is one of the things we are so concerned about, because it is tied up with the milk production. The Bureau of Dairy Industry is making a quick checkup to find out exactly where and what cow-testing associations are in need of cow testers, and we hope to be able tomorrow, if not today, to ask Selective Service for 100 to 150 or 200—whatever the number is that is needed—and they will check over the lists of conscientious objectors, with the view of giving them, where needed, quick training in some of the colleges and putting them out in those cow-testing associations.

USE OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS ON VITAL FOOD PRODUCTION PROJECTS

In addition to that, three State experiment stations have asked for help for putting conscientious objectors onto their vital food production projects, such as hybrid seed corn. And on that we are asking them to limit their requests to approved projects, such as hybrid seed corn, and things that will add up for food production this year and next year, and not long-term food requests.

Those things are adding up, and when we get the numbers, we will again go to Selective Service and say we will vacate so many more of these camps, and ask that these workers be placed there.

Senator RUSSELL. How do these men work? Do they do any work. Do they have any trouble with them?

Mr. DARROW. On the whole, I think they do pretty well. But the Selective Service people tell me you have to check them over pretty carefully; that some of them just don't want to do some of these things, and aren't fitted for them. And if you put them on those farms, you have to check up—and the department did this last season—as to farmers who are willing to take into their midst conscientious objectors.

Senator RUSSELL. There ought not be much danger of crimes of violence, I suppose?

Mr. DARROW. No. The conscientious objectors and the church people—who are doing a grand job in connection with this, doing a lot of financing, buying their food while on these irrigation projects, for instance—they say they prefer projects where you can put them into groups. It is harder to place them on individual farms. And it is harder to use them in cow-testing associations.

By the way, they are being used already, to a small extent, in two eastern States as cow testers. What we are doing now is to check up and see if we can help out and fill in the other gaps.

Senator NYE. Are these conscientious objectors in uniform?

Mr. DARROW. I don't know.

Mr. WEBSTER. I believe not.

Senator RUSSELL. The ones in the soil conservation camps are not in uniform, like the C. C. C. boys used to wear?

Mr. DARROW. I just haven't thought of their being in uniform; I don't know.

I would like to add, Senator, the work they are doing in the S. C. S. camps, all of which are in farming areas, is such that they are available and have been and even now are being used to supply local labor needs out on the farm. They are ready to swing them into action for this seasonal work, as needed.

Senator NYE. Do I understand, then, there isn't a great deal of policing required when these men are assigned tasks?

Mr. DARROW. In the camps, the Selective Service people have charge there, and I don't know what policing they do have. But, such as it is, it is carried out by Selective Service. It seems to be very well organized. When they go out on the individual farms, or on any of this other work, there is no policing at all. I am under the impression not much policing is needed.

Senator RUSSELL. General Hershey testified before the subcommittee investigating farm manpower that they furnished their own clothes; so that they would not wear uniforms.

USE OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS IN FOREST SERVICE

Mr. DARROW. The conscientious objectors in the Forest Service camps are located back in the forest as fire fighters and performing similar work, and the Forest Service people are very reluctant to give up that help, because they are terribly hard up to get any to go in there, and they are very much afraid of fires if they can't have that additional help. So you see it is a great problem of priorities here, to say just where they should go. But we have moved, as I have told you, and we are thinking along those lines.

Senator RUSSELL. Have you anything further, Mr. Secretary?

FEATURES OF PRESENT RESOLUTION JEOPARDIZES MOVEMENT OF LABOR

Secretary WICKARD. I just want to reiterate what I said in response to your question about making any changes as to administration which would jeopardize the movement of laborers. I look upon two or three features of this bill as features which would jeopardize the movement of laborers. If we have to turn that over to other agencies, like the United States Employment Service, who have had no experience in this, they would very likely have to come to us and get our people and our equipment to help them; and I think that in itself would cause delay. We have arrived at a point where we can't afford to delay—we have had too much now. So I hope this committee will take this situation into account in its considerations. We are very much alarmed about it.

Senator RUSSELL. Do you think the Employment Service or any other service or agency of the Government would be more likely to succeed in negotiating a contract?

Secretary WICKARD. I don't know why they should; but that is something for you people to take into consideration. We know the need. We are in great sympathy with the people who are asking us for help, whether it is in the fruit areas, the vegetable areas, or in any other areas. We are constantly in touch with that. And it seems to me it would make for less efficient work all the way around—and I believe the Employment Service themselves would so state—to have them enter into this, and to have the Extension Service in it.

Senator RUSSELL. Are there any other questions?

GREATER DIFFICULTY TO COME AT HARVEST TIME

Senator LODGE. Is it your impression that the trouble will come at the harvest, or at the time of planting?

Secretary WICKARD. At the harvest time.

Senator LODGE. Isn't the planting holding up pretty well?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, sir. The farmers' intentions to plant, as reported last week, are very encouraging, being about 3½ percent larger acreage than last year. Weather like this, with a cold, late, wet spring, makes the problem more difficult. But that was the figure of the March 1 survey, and I think this is what most farmers want to know:

"If we put out the crop, will we have the labor?"

That is a pretty difficult question to answer. And the reason we are urging action such as we are doing here this morning is to get them the labor to harvest their crops.

Senator LODGE. But if you can get the adequate labor for the harvest, enough will have been planted to take you through all right?

Secretary WICKARD. To get the acreage?

Senator LODGE. I don't know that I made myself clear. Enough has been planted so that if you can get the labor for the harvest, it is there to harvest?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; I think enough has been planted, unless we have unusual weather, to get the goals we have set out for the farmers to plant. And I will tell you this, that I think the American people this year, having become alarmed for the first time about their food, are going to take whatever steps are necessary to see the crops are not left to rot on the fields or on the trees. I believe we can get schools and other groups and organizations all over the country to say, if it is necessary to save the crop, they will turn out and help.

Senator RUSSELL. When discussing the reasons for the movement back to the farm, it occurred to me one very obvious reason was that the people who had left the farm had run into the difficulty of getting enough of what they would like to eat, and their minds went back to the time of plenty to eat on the farm; so that the fact that more food would be available on the farms must have a great deal of effect on that situation.

Senator LODGE. I think that is very true.

Actually, Mr. Secretary, nobody is going to starve and nobody is going without clothes?

DEMAND FOR AMERICAN FOOD

Secretary WICKARD. That is true, Senator. May I qualify it by this statement? There is more demand for American food that we can

expect to supply, when we take into consideration the millions of people outside of this country who are dependent upon us and who would like to have our food—the English, the Russians, particularly those in north Africa, and I don't know how many of the occupied countries. And for me to state—which is sometimes misunderstood—we won't have enough to supply the demand, I mean the potential demand. Thus far, the demand has been regulated by the shipping; and when the shipping increased for Russia, for instance, we sent much larger quantities to them than we had contemplated, because we didn't know the shipping would become available. But we are going to have, as you say, Senator—and I am positive of this—enough food in this country, because we are near the source of supply. We have the greatest producing country in the world, and when you are near the source of supply, you hav very little to worry about, as far as getting plenty to eat.

NUMBER OF MALES IN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BETWEEN AGES OF 18 AND 37, INCLUSIVE

Senator LODGE. Now, I am going to ask you one or two questions, which are very short, and which I ask every department which comes up here—to furnish the committee with the number of the males in your department, throughout the country, between the ages of 18 and 38.

Secretary WICKARD. We will have to bring that up to you.

(The number of males in the Department of Agriculture between the ages of 18 and 37, inclusive, was 23,400 as of September 30, 1942.)

Senator LODGE. Yes. And the second question—and my last question—relates to phraseology in this bill. Do you know who wrote this bill?

Secretary WICKARD. No, sir.

Senator LODGE. Do you know where it started, or anything about it?

Secretary WICKARD. The House bill?

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Secretary WICKARD. No, sir. It started in the committee, as far as I know.

Senator LODGE. Not the Agricultural Committee, but in the Appropriations Committee?

Secretary WICKARD. The Appropriations Committee, yes, sir.

MEANING OF DISTRIBUTING FUNDS TO STATES ON "BASIS OF NEED"

Senator LODGE. How will you interpret this phrase on lines 4 and 5, page 2, and lines 22 and 23, page 2—"on the basis of need"?

Secretary WICKARD. Mr. Wilson, can you give us a little explanation of how you would interpret the apportionment of funds?

That is what you are referring to?

Senator LODGE. That is right.

Mr. WILSON. To the Extension Service?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. We have made some very detailed studies of the amount of farm labor, as indicated by the census and by other statistical data which the Department has on farm labor; and we have assumed that they give a rather rough indication as to the size of the labor problem

within a State, and that therefore in allocating these funds to the State extension service, instead of their being allocated on the basis of rural population, or of farm population, as in the case of the Bankhead-Jones or the Smith-Lever Act, that these funds would be allocated on the basis of the labor problems within a State.

Senator LODGE. Do you have figures showing the labor surplus within the State?

DATA ON FARM LABOR EMPLOYED WITHIN STATES

Mr. WILSON. We don't have the surplus. We have a good deal of data on the amount of farm labor employed within a State, that has been employed within a State; and we assume that is reasonably indicative of the demands within the State.

Senator LODGE. Could you furnish the simple basis of apportionment, for the record?

Mr. WILSON. Yes. We could show the statistical tabulations which would be taken into consideration.

Senator LODGE. But that would not be the sole basis?

Mr. WILSON. I don't think it could be the sole basis. There is a question of judgment which has to enter into it.

Senator LODGE. It really would be a matter of personal discretion?

Mr. WILSON. I think so.

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. And it would be worked out with the State extension directors. But we would be glad to submit to the committee this statistical data we have.

The information requested is as follows:

Factors to be considered in determining farm labor needs of States (1940 Census, Bureau of Agricultural Economics data)

States	Number of commercial farms [1]	Number of farms employing labor	Expenditures for farm labor	Number of man-years of labor employed [2]	5-year total farm marketing, 1938-42 [3]
Connecticut	12,587	7,598	$9,078,801	14,342	302,949
Delaware	6,369	4,462	2,087,346	5,154	151,180
Maine	22,808	15,765	5,958,852	12,261	292,042
Maryland	27,969	20,846	10,682,579	25,435	418,629
Massachusetts	19,961	10,555	13,055,845	21,869	424,997
New Hampshire	9,919	5,665	3,297,763	5,496	120,542
New Jersey	19,381	12,351	14,919,478	29,254	571,149
New York	112,932	73,243	37,958,608	82,698	1,824,221
Pennsylvania	111,225	64,757	25,529,084	60,784	1,487,689
Rhode Island	2,210	1,222	1,640,282	2,591	52,907
Vermont	16,738	11,999	4,800,103	9,524	229,632
West Virginia	40,613	26,089	4,012,859	12,160	230,648
Illinois	166,456	93,837	30,884,788	67,730	3,174,092
Indiana	129,072	58,673	14,897,357	38,198	1,719,298
Iowa	190,058	109,132	29,500,447	65,557	3,914,789
Kansas	116,351	61,364	12,140,397	32,635	1,677,637
Michigan	128,174	71,076	19,203,722	44,146	1,332,170
Minnesota	163,196	95,174	21,950,940	51,168	2,229,320
Missouri	164,695	76,720	16,698,517	54,041	1,704,690
Nebraska	98,537	46,887	13,413,515	31,704	1,407,958
North Dakota	62,310	38,950	9,603,606	26,009	842,176
Ohio	157,997	82,646	23,278,083	57,906	1,936,118

[1] Those selling, trading, or using farm products valued at $400 or more.

[2] Calculated by dividing expenditures for farm labor (1939) by 12 times the monthly wage rate for each State in 1939—Farm Wage Rates, Farm Employment, and Related Data, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, January 1943.

[3] From The Farm Income Situation, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, February 1943 and February 1942, and Gross Income and Government Payments, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, May 1941. Amounts expressed in thousands of dollars.

Factors to be considered in determining farm labor needs of States (1940 Census, Bureau of Agricultural Economics data)—Continued

States	Number of commercial farms	Number of farms employing labor	Expenditures for farm labor	Number of man-years of labor employed	5-year total farm marketing, 1938–42
South Dakota	57,475	30,861	5,948,414	15,613	733,532
Wisconsin	156,882	85,573	21,298,655	49,997	1,860,970
Alabama	104,657	58,688	8,421,752	40,685	604,400
Arkansas	129,812	50,878	12,738,817	51,160	934,499
Florida	31,330	27,896	20,977,631	79,461	696,488
Georgia	140,426	78,703	16,505,107	85,964	816,949
Kentucky	122,205	66,100	11,943,901	39,032	886,704
Louisiana	85,650	38,924	14,546,990	60,612	618,238
Mississippi	147,554	41,968	9,147,929	41,771	887,404
North Carolina	199,812	95,346	14,835,885	56,842	1,371,090
Oklahoma	112,583	65,634	12,137,926	35,805	1,145,989
South Carolina	90,904	51,288	11,552,491	62,110	553,258
Tennessee	130,751	69,065	9,769,787	39,715	807,653
Texas	269,005	190,018	56,585,641	184,920	3,136,480
Virginia	98,057	59,763	17,326,650	52,987	721,720
Arizona	9,261	5,891	9,670,792	18,325	340,415
California	98,426	82,888	114,123,135	173,703	3,815,811
Colorado	35,515	25,556	13,525,693	33,397	763,236
Idaho	33,929	25,483	11,487,378	22,792	559,967
Montana	31,548	22,682	11,676,533	22,761	574,927
Nevada	2,475	1,839	2,403,134	4,005	75,879
New Mexico	16,174	10,079	5,521,186	15,730	316,011
Oregon	39,117	30,562	15,962,123	29,396	675,638
Utah	18,469	12,653	4,388,123	7,780	275,690
Washington	48,790	35,244	20,405,130	37,108	937,172
Wyoming	11,734	7,606	6,714,633	14,166	293,844
United States total	4,002,089	2,260,237	781,791,558	2,025,559	50,453,797

Senator LODGE. Thank you very much.

And if somebody could give me some light on where this bill started out and who wrote it, and why it was written in the Appropriations Committee, I would be grateful.

(A discussion followed off the record.)

APPLICATION OF PROVISION ON DISTRIBUTING FUNDS ON BASIS OF NEED

Senator MCCARRAN. I would like to ask a question, Mr. Chairman, with reference to lines 4 and 5, again, on page 2, and your discussion of it. Coming from a State of sparse population and rather meager pretension as far as agriculture is concerned, I am wondering how such a State would be considered with respect to that language. In other words, where we have necessity, our necessity is just as great as though in a great agricultural district.

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir. We have statistical material as to the amount of labor you have employed in years past.

Senator MCCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. And as to the wages you have paid to that labor, the number of farms that have employed labor, and the length of time they have employed labor. We have tried to put that together into some kind of an index which shows relatively, you see, how much labor and the character of the labor employed.

We do not believe these allocations can be made upon a purely mathematical basis. That gives us something as a guide. Then I think we have to bring our best judgment into balance with that. As an illustration, these States that have this great migratory labor problem

in connection with the vegetable and canning and sugar-beet industries, as far as that is concerned, have a bigger labor problem than a State which has diversified farming and in which most of the labor that will come will have to be mobilized within the State in towns and villages themselves.

Senator RUSSELL. As I see it, there has to be some discretion granted in this matter to somebody, somehow, because you have no provision to require compliance of the States, such as you have with the Extension Service, for example; and before the State legislatures could all meet and provide funds for meeting these contributions, if that is to be done, we would have lost the crop, or such part of it as could be saved through this provision.

Mr. WILSON. We have understood these allotments would be made to the State, but there would be no State offset.

Senator RUSSELL. And in the very nature of things, it would destroy the very purpose of the bill, not to have such discretion.

INTENTIONS TO PLANT REPORT

Senator NYE. I would like to ask just one question. The crop report of last week was a delightful surprise, was it not?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes.

Senator NYE. Could you say offhand what is true of the Northwest in that prospectus?

Secretary WICKARD. You don't mean Senator Holman's territory?

Senator NYE. No; Montana and the Dakotas.

Secretary WICKARD. Can you give us that, Mr. Webster? Generally speaking, the Midwest, the part of the country you are asking about, showed quite an increase. The moisture conditions, I think, are conducive to a larger planting. The reason I say that is that we have a greater planting of flax.

Senator NYE. Which you have been working hard to accomplish?

Secretary WICKARD. That is right.

Senator NYE. But with as little fall plowing as was done in that section last fall, I am just wondering what the anticipation can be.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FARM MACHINERY

Secretary WICKARD. Of course, you know what we need. We need more machinery for your territory.

Senator NYE. What has happened on the machinery end of it?

Secretary WICKARD. Well, we have gotten some relief, but not as much as I would like to see, particularly for harvesting machinery at this time. I am particularly worried about the harvesting machinery, after we get these crops planted. The machinery for harvesting must be ready at the farm the day the crop is ready, because, if you are going to make hay, you must be on the job that day. It doesn't make any difference how many machines may be elsewhere; that doesn't do you any good. That is something I have been pressing hard, to get the War Production Board to allow us more steel for the harvesting machinery. Heretofore, they didn't want to give me the kind of steel the manufacturers say they have to have; but they want to give me Bessemer steel, which the manufacturers can use only in small quantities.

NEED FOR USE OF EXISTING MACHINERY

Senator RUSSELL. In that connection, Mr. Secretary, I am wondering if you are using all of the machinery in existence. A farmer came to see me when I was home last week, and said he needed a drag harrow; that there were four of them in his town and four in the adjoining town; that he had a permit to buy one, but couldn't get it because it was in excess of the quota. That seems to me to be a very unusual situation there.

Secretary WICKARD. A drag harrow?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes; I think that was it.

Secretary WICKARD. Just a horse-drawn harrow?

Senator RUSSELL. I think he used it with a tractor.

DIFFICULTIES ARISING OUT OF CONCENTRATION ORDER

Secretary WICKARD. Yes; well, it doesn't matter how it is used. There was what is known as a concentration order which went through, which caused a lot of trouble. The concentration order provided for the manufacture of such implements as you refer to. And that has given us no end of trouble, because most of the small manufacturers have sold their product in nearby areas, and are not located in areas where there is as much labor shortage as there is in the case of the larger manufacturers; and the larger manufacturers had converted their plants to the making of tanks and other pieces of armament.

And we have had trouble getting salesmen and dealers in areas where the larger manufacturers had an outlet or usually had sold their product. But I hadn't heard of anything like what you mention.

Senator RUSSELL. It was inconceivable to me.

Secretary WICKARD. Can you give me the county?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes; I will write you a letter about it.

PHOSPHATE

Senator THOMAS. Is phosphate being rationed now?

Secretary WICKARD. No; phosphate isn't being rationed.

Senator THOMAS. I have a letter from a friend in Oklahoma that he wanted to buy some phosphate, but they couldn't sell it to him because he wasn't a cooperator.

Secretary WICKARD. A cooperator in what?

Senator THOMAS. That is what he wanted to know. I expect I had better send you that letter.

(A discussion followed off the record.)

INTENTION TO PLANT REPORT

Senator NYE. I wonder if Mr. Webster has found any data on my question.

Mr. WEBSTER. I can give you several crops: On spring wheat, Minnesota is up 5 percent and North Dakota is up 2 percent.

On durum, North Dakota, 1 percent; Minnesota, 10 percent.

On barley, North Dakota up 20 percent, and Minnesota is only 86 percent of last year.

Senator NYE. Have you the flax figures there?

Mr. WEBSTER. On flax, North Dakota is indicated up 29 percent, and Minnesota 14 percent.

On potatoes, North Dakota no change, Minnesota up 10 percent.

Those are an indication of some of the crops up there.

QUESTION AS TO WHETHER FARMERS HAVE TO HAVE A PERMIT AND ALSO OBTAIN RATION TICKETS FOR MEAT THEY SELL

[See. p. 221]

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, this has no direct bearing on this bill. But you mentioned a while ago something about issuing certificates for the sale of meats and things of that kind. If a small farmer were to sell one ham, does he have to be licensed and get a ration ticket before he can sell the ham?

Secretary WICKARD. Yes, that is the contemplated procedure. He will have to be given a permit to sell meat, and keep a record of what he sells. He doesn't have to have a permit to sell an individual piece, or anything like that.

Senator RUSSELL. I understand that. Suppose I am home and a farmer living at an adjoining farm happens to have a ham. He isn't in the business of selling meat, but has enough for his own use. And he has this ham left over from last year, which I happen to buy from him. Does he have to get ration tickets in that case, or does he have to get a permit to sell it?

Secretary WICKARD. I can't answer that just now. I would have to put that in the record, if it is desired.

Senator RUSSELL. If those people are going to have to collect ration tickets and get a license also, you are going to have more kick-back than Senator Thomas referred to.

Secretary WICKARD. Let me say this in justification. We are unable now to get enough meat to supply the Army. The Army asks for priorities to buy the meat. You know what that means.

Senator RUSSELL. I was thinking of the little people, with a small quantity of meat to sell, if they have to go through all this process of licensing and collecting of ration coupons.

Senator THOMAS. If he should sell that ham, would that be an illustration of a black market?

Senator RUSSELL. Of course it would, unless he had a permit.

NEED FOR LEAVING DISCRETION IN LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Senator HAYDEN. The practical way to handle a matter of that kind is to leave some discretion in the local authorities in the administration of the law. The Office of Price Administration has been in too much difficulty because they tried to do too much through the Washington office. We had the case at home the other day of a man who has a permit to graze sheep in a grazing district. He has a limited number; so he has to sell his increase. He offered his lambs for sale to a packer who operates under the Stockyards Act, and he cut back 45 lambs because they were not suitable for graded meat. Then he took the 45 lambs to the local butcher, who didn't kill any lambs in 1941. So under the regulation he couldn't butcher the lambs.

Now, if the man takes the lambs back onto the range, he loses his permit, because they exceed the permit.

Secretary WICKARD. All we are doing, Senator, which I think ought to be in line with your suggestion, as I said, a while ago, we are depending upon these committees, selected by farmers themselves, to apply this thing you are just now discussing, in getting it out to those people out in the communities. I agree wth you that we don't have any opportunty of getting compliance with the regulations and restrictions which are going to be necessary in wartime if we don't depend upon the people themselves and the people right in the community.

Senator HAYDEN. You appoint a committee of farmers in the locality, and they want to be just as patriotic as you and I.

Senator RUSSELL. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. The committee will meet again tomorrow morning at 10:30, and I hope all the members of the subcommittee can be here.

(Whereupon, the subcommittee was adjourned at 1:15 p. m. until 10:30 the following morning, Tuesday, March 23, 1943.)

FARM LABOR PROGRAM, 1943

TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1943

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met in the committee room, the Capitol, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:30, a. m., Hon. Richard B. Russell, presiding.

Present: Senators Russell, Hayden, Tydings, Overton, Thomas of Oklahoma, McCarran, O'Mahoney, Bankhead, Nye, Lodge, and Holman.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD A. O'NEAL, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, AND W. R. OGG, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, NATIONAL FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Senator RUSSELL. The committee will come to order. We have with us Mr. Edward A. O'Neal of the Farm Bureau Federation. We will be glad to have you make such statement as you see fit in connection with this pending legislation, Mr. O'Neal.

Mr. O'Neal. Thank you, Senator Russell and Senators.

I have a brief statement here and if I may have the indulgence of the committee I have some friends here who would like to testify; two or three other gentlemen, very briefly.

Senator RUSSELL. All right.

FOOD PROGRAM

Mr. O'NEAL. A serious food shortage is already a reality, and the situation next winter may prove calamitous unless there is immediate correction of price policies and manpower policies. The situation, of course, requires more far-reaching action than can be accomplished under H. J. Res. 96, which deals only with one phase of the problem. In order to avert a food disaster, it is imperative that price ceilings and price supports be adjusted to whatever extent necessary to offset increased costs, including farm labor costs, and to enable farmers to produce to capacity. We need to make better use of our manpower resources through lengthening the workwork to 54 hours without premium pay for overtime above 40 hours.

NEED FOR PLAN FOR RECRUITING, TRAINING, AND PLACEMENT OF FARM LABOR

Finally, it is imperative to provide a practicable, workable plan for recruiting, training, and placement of farm labor in order to

assure that farmers can get the labor they need at the time they need it without being hindered by unnecessary bureaucratic controls an procedures or harassed by unworkable regulations and restrictions.

HANDLING TO DATE OF FARM-LABOR PROGRAM

Up to now, we have not had such a program. The farm-labor program has been badly bungled, and all too often farmers have been harassed and hindered instead of helped in securing increased production. Considerable quantities of food have already been lost because of the failure to provide a satisfactory workable program of recruiting and placing farm labor to meet the requirements of farmers. We dare not take any further chances or risk any further experimentation in recruiting and placing farm labor. Furthermore, with the planting season already upon us, the time is too short to set up any new agencies in Washington. Neither can we afford to risk the delays and confusion incident to divided authority and responsibility among numerous agencies. That is why we opposed the proposed farm-labor plan submitted to Congress by the Department of Agriculture.

PROGRAM AS SET UP UNDER BUDGET ESTIMATE

Under this program, the Secretary would be given a blank-check appropriation of $65,000,000 to handle the farm-labor program, but apparently would delegate the responsibility to numerous agencies, including a new farm-labor administration set up in the Department of Agriculture headed by Mr. Wayne Darrow, the Farm Security Administration, the Agricultural Extension Service, the agricultural war boards, and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Under this plan, approximately $6,000,000 would be allocated to the Agricultural Extension Service to mobilize three to three and one-half million local workers. Practically all of the remaining funds would be turned over to the Farm Security Administration to recruit, transport, and place approximately 350,000 seasonal workers—including about 50,000 Mexican workers—and approximately 42.000 year-around workers, and to develop, construct, and operate 250 additional new farm labor camps and shelters.

The Extension Service would be expected to recruit and place 90 percent of the workers with about 10 percent of the money; while the Farm Security Administration would be allocated about 90 percent of the funds for recruiting, transportation, and placing about 10 percent of the workers. Furthermore, large amounts of money would be utilized for overhead administrative expenses, including 1¼ million dollars for operating the new farm-labor unit in the Department of Agriculture, $3,000,000 for administration and supervision by the Farm Security Administration, and several million dollars for management and operation of the additional farm-labor camps.

POSITION OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION RELATIVE TO PROGRAM AS SET UP UNDER BUDGET ESTIMATE

We are strongly opposed to this plan. We do not believe it will get the results we must have if farmers are to get the labor they need when they need it. Furthermore, we are strongly opposed to setting up another bureaucracy in the Department of Agriculture and attempting to handle the farm-labor problem under an expensive centralized program from Washington.

ENDORSEMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96 AS PASSED BY HOUSE

That is why we strongly favor House Joint Resolution 96, which was approved by the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote of 195 to 81.

The House Appropriations Committee, composed of 43 Members of the House, gave extended hearings to this problem, and the full committee refused to approve the Department plan for farm labor, and recommitted it to the subcommittee to bring in a better plan. The committee later adopted, by a practically 2-to-1 vote, H. J. Res. 96, and the House after 2 days of debate, gave overwhelming approval to it. The Department of Agriculture plan, which was offered as a substitute, received only 28 votes in the House of Representatives.

We sincerely hope that this committee and the Senate will speedily approve H. J. Res. 96, and reject all amendments to divide the responsibility and authority for this program or centralize its control in Washington.

This issue of centralization of control of agricultural programs versus decentralization with State and local autonomy, was thoroughly debated and considered before the House Appropriations Committee, and during the 2 days of debate in the House. The issue was clearly drawn.

The Department's plan vested control and responsibility theoretically in the Secretary of Agriculture but actually in the newly created Farm Labor Administration which was to be given 1¼ million dollars to build up another Government bureau to control and direct all farm labor recruitment and placement through several different agencies, of which the Farm Security Administration, another outstanding bureaucracy was to get most of the money appropriated.

H. J. Res. 96 embodies the opposite philosophy. It provides a program of decentralization. Only $100,000 is provided for Washington administration. All of the funds for recruiting and placing 90 percent of the labor is turned over to the extension services in the States and they are put in charge of the programs in their States and counties, but authorized to cooperate with any other agency, either public or private. Through cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service, either national, regional, or within States, with the extension services, imported labor or interstate or intrastate labor may be recruited and transported. Each State can work out a program best adapted to the needs and conditions.

UTILIZATION OF EXTENSION SERVICE

H. J. Res. 96 uses the Extension Service, a going agency with a record of 25 years of successful operation and achievement, which is decentralized in its set-up, which is close to the people, which has a Nation-wide organization with organizations in every State and practically every one of the 3,000 agricultural counties, which has working relationships already established by law and by cooperative agreement with the United States Department of Agriculture, which could be in action over night if given this responsibility, and last, but not least, which enjoys the confidence of the great majority of farmers.

This is the first major test in this Congress between the philosophy of centralized, bureaucratic control over agricultural programs

and the philosophy of more democratic, decentralized operations, with greater State and local autonomy. It is bureaucracy versus true democracy.

The House of Representatives left no doubt of its overwhelming judgment of this issue—the Department's plan only mustering 28 votes out of 435. The great majority of farmers in this country have registered how they feel on this crucial issue again and again. I sincerely hope the United States Senate will be equally emphatic in checking any further centralization of control or any further bureaucracy.

ADVANTAGES OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96 AS PASSED BY HOUSE

Gentlemen, it will be a tragic mistake to risk any further failures in our manpower program for farmers. That is why it is imperative to pass H. J. Res. 96 at the earliest possible moment.

The advantages of this plan may be summarized as follows:

USE OF EXTENSION SERVICE

First, it uses the Extension Service and the United States Employment Service, the two agencies which have Nation-wide organizations of trained, experienced personnel, which could get into action overnight if they are given this responsibility.

DIVIDED RESPONSIBILITY AVOIDED

Second, it avoids divided responsibility, and centralizes responsibility for the program in one agency—the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the States. However, in order to get the job done, they are authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service on the Federal level and with the Employment Service or any other agency on the State level.

DECENTRALIZATION OF PROGRAM

Third, it provides for decentralization of this program and permits the maximum flexibility in adapting plans and procedures to meet local needs and local conditions. More than one-half of the money ($13,500,000) will be turned over to the agricultural extension service in the States. The extension service in each State will be in charge of the recruiting, training, and placement of farm labor within the State. Each State can work out a program best adapted to its own conditions. A State extension service is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services and to cooperate with any other public or private agency. In addition, any individual State or group of States can get together and work out a special agreement with the Employment Service covering the handling of imported or interstate labor into their States.

BUREAUCRATIC CONTROL AVOIDED

Fourth, it avoids bureaucratic control from Washington. Only $100,000 is provided for supervision and general administration in the

Federal Office of Extension. In addition, $12,500,000 is allocated to the Federal Office of Extension with which to carry out cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service for the recruiting, transportation, and payment of temporary subsistence of imported labor and migratory labor moved from one State to another. However, in the working out of any agreements through the Employment Service the Federal Office of Extension is required to consult the directors of extension in the States affected to help negotiate the agreement with the Employment Service.

PROCEDURES AND CONTROLS SIMPLIFIED

Fifth, it would eliminate impractical, bureaucratic procedures and controls which interfere with rather than help farmers and farm workers produce to capacity. It will prohibit the fixing of minimum wages, regulating hours of work or promoting collective bargaining or unionization of agricultural labor, who have been exempted from such regulations under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the National Labor Relations Act.

MAXIMUM RESULTS AT LEAST COST

Sixth, this program will get the maximum results at far less cost than the plan submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

NEED FOR ACTION AT THIS TIME

Gentlemen, time is precious. It is imperative that Congress provide now for the establishment of a practical, workable plan— a plan that will avoid duplication, overlapping, and divided responsibility— to recruit manpower for the farm. We believe the plan overwhelmingly approved by the House offers the best and only available solution at this late date. There is no time to set up another costly and cumbersome Government agency to handle this problem. It is necessary that we use the best means at hand to give the farmer the help he needs to plant and harvest the crops so vitally needed in the winning of the war.

Other plans and experiments have failed. We cannot afford to experiment any longer. We believe it good judgment and common sense to turn the job over to practical people whose competence, interest in and devotion to agriculture is beyond question. If anyone can do the job, we believe the Extension people can.

Planting season is now at hand. Mother Nature does not wait. On the celerity and dispatch with which a legislative remedy of this problem is offered may depend to a great degree the adequacy of our food supply, this year and next.

Senator McCarran. In other words, you do not agree with the bureaucrat who wrote to the sheep man that he should defer his lambing season.

Mr. O'Neal. I certainly do not.

Senator Holman. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Senator Russell. Yes.

WORK AND PAY OF COUNTY AGRICULTURAL AGENTS

Senator HOLMAN. I should like to present this question to you. House Joint Resolution 96 calls for additional work on the part of the local county agricultural agents, does it not?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLMAN. They already have so much paper work to do that they cannot perform the functions for which they were originally employed; that is, going out on the farms and instructing the farmers in scientific agriculture.

I have introduced a bill which augments the appropriation available for the Extension Service by $20,000,000 a year for the purpose of supplying these local county agriculture agents with office assistance and so forth, to relieve the agents of this paper work. At the same time, I have orally requested the Secretary of Agriculture to go through his department and to eliminate as much of this paper work as he can, which I believe is unnecessary and cumbersome.

We have gathered data and statistics of past histories; but today is today.

Now, that is the program that I have in mind. Increased appropriations should be provided for the pay of county agricultural agents. Incidentally, I think their rate of pay should be increased over what it was when it was fixed years ago. If their pay is not increased, we soon will be losing them to shipyards and other types of employment for which the rate of pay is higher.

I offer that thought and want to know if you have any comments to make on it.

Mr. O'NEAL. Well, I thoroughly approve. As you know, you gentlemen who have sat around this table for years I have been coming here, the fundamental principle in a set up and philosophy of the land-grant college system and the county agents, and a number of Senators know I have come here and urged the necessity of taking better care of them, and I agree with you that we will be here later and we hope that your associates will agree with some of the suggestions that we are going to make.

Senator LODGE. Definitely, along that line, they should have more money?

Mr. O'NEAL. They should have greater assistance, and they should have less papers from Washington to sign.

DIVIDED AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY IN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. O'Neal, I am greatly impressed with that portion of your statement that there is definite confusion in divided authority and responsibility. I think that has been one of our troubles.

From reading this bill, however, I am not clear that the situation is corrected. If there is not division of responsibility between the Extension Service and the Federal Employment Service, why, it leaves a good deal to the imagination.

Mr. O'NEAL. Well I think that you can strengthen that some, Senator. We felt, and I think the gentlemen in the House felt, that that was being done. In other words, after all, the supreme power

is given in the bill as we interpret it, to the Extension Service and then they can make the Employment Service perform. Now you——

Senator RUSSELL. I am afraid not under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. O'NEAL. I think that could be broadened out.

Senator RUSSELL. I am afraid, as I construe it, it would not do that.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. O'NEAL. You can broaden it out and say that other agencies that they may select. You see what I mean. In other words, if the Employment Service is selected.

Now, I asked this question before the Byrnes committee where I am supposed to be an adviser on economic affairs and sit around and listen and am asked to vote now and then when they need an alibi.

But, that question was discussed and I asked Mr. Smith of the Budget about the Employment Service—how well did it cooperate?

Farmers in a great many areas claim that it is just a recruiting agency for union labor.

Senator RUSSELL. There is some justification for it too.

Mr. O'NEAL. And in other places—and this reply was given, that in a number of the States they have done a very excellent job.

Now, I have some witnesses a little later, who probably can develop that. In the great State of New York where many people live; they have been working the problem out there, they have worked out a very fine program with the Employment Service, I understand.

DIVIDED AUTHORITY IN HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96

Senator RUSSELL. This bill does not make it clear to my mind. I do not have any doubt as to that, but just exactly how it should be amended, as to who has the authority over this $12,500,000——

Mr. O'NEAL (interposing). We have some amendments. We discovered that too, Senator, and we thought that it ought to be strengthened.

Senator RUSSELL. I have given a great deal of study to it. I am afraid that there will be a lot of difficulty here. It says, for example, that rules and regulations shall be formulated by the Federal Extension Service and the United States Employment Service. Those agencies are in different departments and if they disagree, who is going to settle it?

Mr. O'NEAL. We thought that the bill said that the Extension Service.

Senator RUSSELL. That is not the language.

Mr. O'NEAL. And we discovered that after the bill was passed.

Senator RUSSELL. It says:

> may enter into such agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such labor, subject to general rules and regulations to be issued by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the United States Employment Service.

If that says which one will have the final power, why, I do not understand the wording.

Mr. O'NEAL. Of course, I think the authors of the bill all feel and that they want to put it strong enough so that the Extension Service has the authority. That is the fact.

Senator RUSSELL. It ought to be lodged there?

Mr. O'NEAL. We have worked on that.

Senator RUSSELL. It either ought to be given to the United States Employment Service or to the Extension Service, one or the other, because the way it runs through here now, it is not even definitely clear to my mind as to who should have this $12,500,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. I hope that you will clarify that and give it to the Extension Service. That is what we intended.

Senator BANKHEAD. It is my understanding that those who drew this bill intended for it to be handled through the Extension Service and that they should have control of the labor movement within the State.

Senator RUSSELL. There is no question about that.

Senator BANKHEAD. And that the Employment Service as between two States, or interstate. Now, where have you got the dividing line?

Senator NYE. I do not think that that is clearly written in here at all.

Senator RUSSELL. I do not either.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is what we are driving at.

Senator RUSSELL. It is very clear who has the authority within the State. That is the Extension Service.

Mr. O'NEAL. There are two divisions there.

Senator RUSSELL. I understand that within a State the Extension Service is to handle it. That is clear enough. I do not think we need to do anything about that.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Ogg has worked with me and has worked on that point, worked pretty closely on the bill in the preparation of the bill.

Mr. OGG. We had hoped that we could take care of that very point.

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

CLARIFYING AMENDMENT NEEDED TO PLACE DEFINITELY RESPONSIBILITY FOR INTERSTATE LABOR

Senator RUSSELL. I think something is going to have to be done to clarify that.

Senator NYE. We should have a clarifying amendment.

Mr. OGG. We have some clarifying amendments to make sure that the Extension Service would have the responsibility and safeguarding of the money.

Senator RUSSELL. I think it is well to give some attention to that, because there is confusion here. One of the most experienced and thorough legislators in this country told me that he thought that it would be put in the Employment Service. I cannot decide where it is.

Mr. OGG. May I call your attention, Senator, to the provision on page 1, that is, the opening, and then over on page 2. We thought that the opening provisions clearly placed all of the responsibility on the Extension Service in the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the Employment Service.

Senator RUSSELL. I certainly would not so construe it if you are going to have this language on pages 3 and 4 retained.

Mr. OGG. Now, the purpose of that, Senator, was to provide an alternative. The first provision was to provide that all of the authority and responsibility should be vested in the Office of the Extension Service in cooperation with the extension service in the States in working out a cooperative agreement with the Employment Services and turning over such money as the Extension Service felt was required.

Then this provision you referred to a while ago was merely intended to be an alternative provision so that any one State or any group of States could get together independently or separately and work out an agreement. We will say, take for example California, Arizona, and New Mexico. They want labor from Mexico.

The purpose of this second provision was to provide that the extension directors in those three States could get together and work out a special agreement with the Employment Service covering the implication of workers from Mexico into those States only; but which would have to be worked out within the over-all framework referred to in this first revisal.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is the way I first understood it.

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Ogg, your proposition is much clearer in my mind than the verbiage here in the bill.

Mr. OGG. We have some language we would like to submit which I think would clarify it.

Mr. O'NEAL. I think you are right about that.

Senator LODGE. Did you write the bill?

Mr. OGG. I assisted in it; yes.

INTERPRETATION OF DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ON BASIS OF NEED

Senator LODGE. Could you enlighten me as to what meaning you had in mind in using the words appearing in lines 4 and 5 on page 2 and lines 22 and 23 on page 2, which read: "on the basis of need."

What is meant?

Mr. OGG. What line is that, Senator?

Senator LODGE. Lines 4 and 5, and lines 22 and 23 on page 2.

Mr. OGG. I understand that the purpose was only to apportion the money to the States on the basis of requirements for recruiting and placing labor in the States.

You see that it says before that that this program shall be carried out "on the basis of existing cooperative agreements between the Department and the land-grant colleges as to the conduct of extension work and apportioned to the States on the basis of need for the purposes specified therein," and those agreements are worked out pursuant to statutes which have definite formulas for apportionment, which are known to the States, for extension work, and the purposes of this was not to restrict this money to any existing formula, but permit a special distribution basis to be set up on this problem.

Senator LODGE. Thank you.

Mr. OGG. New formula, based on the new formula only.

Senator MCCARRAN. On a new formula?

Senator LODGE. What factor is used in developing the formula?

Mr. OGG. That would have to be a matter of agreement between the Office of the Extension Service and the State directors of extension. They would sit down, I assume, together and place the needs of the different States before them and work it out on an equitable distribution basis, on the needs as disclosed in their conferences.

Senator LODGE. You mean the need for farm labor?

Mr. OGG. The need for recruiting and placing of farm labor in the States.

Senator LODGE. Well, how would that react in the case we had yesterday? I will state it this way: Yesterday we were told that the Department is going to try to encourage subsistence farms, of which they used to have a great many, particularly in my part of the country. A man would work in a factory in the morning and then he has a little garden, or a small farm, a couple of pigs, and that kind of thing, and that sort of farming has gone out.

Where a new type of agricultural activity is contemplated, how will this formula of yours react on that?

Mr. OGG. May I say that the word "need" was not, I think, intended to refer to the need of the farmers for financial assistance; it was merely intended to refer to the need of the State extension service for funds to do this recruiting and placement of workers. How many farmers are needed in this State; how many have to be recruited and transported. As I understand it that is the intention.

Senator MCCARRAN. Primarily it would be based on the need for farm labor.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is right.

Senator LODGE. As it has been developed in the past?

Mr. O'NEAL. That is right.

Senator LODGE. You are not talking about that?

Mr. OGG. As it is now, Senator. Workers to be recruited and placed now under this program. In other words, how many workers will you need in Massachusetts on the farms? How many have you got to recruit within your State? How many have you got to get from other States and how many have you got to give some training. That will all be taken into consideration in connection with those functions.

Senator MCCARRAN. We have existing in this country now, if we construe the word "need" to mean any other thing, we have existing in this country now localities where people with all kinds of wealth to employ with, so far as you construe need that way; they have ample funds to employ, but they cannot find labor to employ at any price.

Senator BANKHEAD. I think the "need" as it is used here is used to express the "need" for the work.

Mr. O'NEAL. Need for the work.

Senator BANKHEAD. On the farm.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is what we want to specify.

Mr. OGG. Need for persons as specified here, for recruiting and replacing farm labor.

REASON FOR MEASURE BEING BEFORE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Senator LODGE. Thank you. I would like to ask one more question. Maybe you can answer it and maybe you cannot.

Why do you consider it better to have this legislative matter coming efore the Appropriations Committee rather than to go in the normal ourse through the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. Ogg. I do not know that I can fully answer you; but as I under- and it, this item was transmitted by the President in a supplemental stimate through the Budget Bureau to the House and at the time e deficiency bill was before the committee, and the committee felt at it was of such importance that it should be left out of the de- ciency bill and acted on as a special resolution. That is my under- anding of it. That is the explanation that was made to the House, believe. That is, instead of including this as another item in the eficiency bill, the committee felt that they wanted to get more in- ormation and so they decided to hold it out of the deficiency bill nd prepare a special resolution.

Senator Thomas. Mr. Chairman, the processes of the Congress would em to indicate pretty clearly, in answer to the Senator's question, at if this were to go to the Committees on Agriculture, all that the gislative committees could do would be to pass an authorization ct.

Mr. O'Neal. That is right.

Senator Thomas. And this bill, being an emergency bill is both n authorization act and an appropriation act, with the fundamental r main part being an appropriation. I can see very clearly why n the interest of efficiency and speed it can come to this committee ather than go to the Agricultural Committee.

Mr. Bankhead. In other words, the House Appropriations Commit- ee had to decide that the legislation was necessary rather than to ppropriate under deficiency estimates or a deficiency appropriation fter the machinery had been set up.

Senator Lodge. What is the date of the President's message?

Mr. Ogg. You will find the text of the language on page 1 of the House hearings. It was submitted, I think, about February 16.

Senator Russell. February 11.

Mr. Ogg. And I might say we appeared before the House Appro- riations Subcommittee on Deficiencies, when this was up as an item or inclusion under the deficiency bill, and it was only after they had ad several days of hearings that the committee decided not to in- lude this in the deficiency bill but to bring it in as a special resolu- ion. I think you will find that the chairman of the committee made hat explanation to the House.

Senator Lodge. This is favored by the Department of Agriculture, hen, is it not?

Mr. Ogg. Well, this estimate was sent over by the President.

Senator Bankhead. For a much larger sum.

Mr. Ogg. And the special message was for $65,000,000. That was he amount originally, Senator, which you will find there on pages and 2 of the House Hearings. That is the original estimate, sent ver by the President for inclusion in the deficiency bill.

The committee disapproved that and substituted this House joint esolution No. 96.

ATTITUDE OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96

Senator Lodge. But this H. J. Res. 96 is favored by the Depart- nent of Agriculture, is it not?

Mr. OGG. Well, I do not think so.

Mr. O'NEAL. The Record on the vote, Senator Lodge, shows that there was a fight on the floor of the House. You will find that in the Congressional Record.

Senator BANKHEAD. The Secretary was up here yesterday.

Mr. O'NEAL. He is not in favor of this bill, unless he has changed. He had one of his own.

Mr. OGG. Yes.

Senator RUSSELL. The Secretary made a very general statement. He stated that it was necessary for something to be done about the farm labor situation and that some steps should be taken immediately to provide for the recruiting and placement of farm labor. He did not, as I understood his statement, specifically say that he opposed this joint resolution as such; but he did conclude by saying that he thought if the Congress expected him to do the job it ought not to tie his hands. I rather inferred that he felt that this joint resolution before us did in a measure tie his hands.

I will say he was not specially critical of this measure; not as much as might be expected.

Senator LODGE. That is a very clear statement of the Secretary's position.

STATUS OF AGREEMENTS WITH MEXICO UNDER HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. O'Neal, there are one or two other points about this bill that disturb me, that is, the details disturb me somewhat.

It very clearly is the intent of the bill to have Congress annul the contracts or agreements that have heretofore been entered into with the Government of Mexico, and I believe since the bill passed the House one has been had with the Government of the Bahamas, as to the importation of farm labor.

Do you think that it would be possible to negotiate an agreement with Mexico outside of the Government, for their sending of their citizens to this country to work, unless some kind of an understanding as to what they will be paid or whether they will have payment is reached?

Mr. O'NEAL. Senator Russell, my answer to that, without——I am sorry that we could not get some gentlemen here from that area, where they are working the Mexicans, but to summarize it all, why, it worked fine until the Administration got to fooling with it. In other words, it just played havoc with it and messed it all up.

Senator McCARRAN. How?

Mr. O'NEAL. Well, with a lot of rules and regulations; wages and hours.

Senator McCARRAN. Working conditions?

Mr. O'NEAL. Working conditions and all that sort of thing. Where in former years all you had to do was to go to Mexico and look at the men who came in and worked under the old conditions, their economic status, as compared to the fellows who lived in Mexico and did not work in this country. In other words, they got Mexicans in large numbers to come over and do this work. They paid them well. They got good prices for picking cotton; gathering vegetables; hoeing sugar

beets, or weeding sugar beets, and all of that. The thing worked fine until they got this new arrangement.

I am awfully glad I did not go down to Mexico. Secretary Hull asked me to go at the time the Secretary of Agriculture and Mr. Patton of the Farmers' Union went down there. I am glad now I did not go. I smelled a sort of a rat coming out of a hole, or something down there, that organized labor was going to take charge of the Mexican situation, and I think that they have.

Now, there are some amendments——

Senator RUSSELL. You are not referring to any agreement then with the Government?

It is your position that you can get all of the Mexican labor you want by dealing with the individual Mexicans?

Mr. O'NEAL. This thing I say is good. Read history, Senator Russell, and you will see what the facts are.

Now, you have got this new situation. That is really what you have got to meet, this new situation.

I say that the Government of the United States certainly has the authority there to renegotiate an agreement for either agency to handle Mexican labor.

Senator RUSSELL. I understand that. There is no question about that authority. There is no doubt in my mind as to what agency of the Government is supposed to negotiate it, but under the language of this bill they could not tell the Mexican that he will be paid even the going wage.

Mr. O'NEAL. Well, you could strengthen the bill a little bit in that respect; but the farmers are very seriously opposed to, as you know yourself, that wages-and-hours agreement as a whole. There is plenty of opposition to it. The thing I am citing you again—I am turning back—is that those Mexicans did come to this country without the wages-and-hours agreement; came by the thousands; were well paid and went back home; their economic status was so much better than the average Mexican. That is the answer to what you are talking about. In other words, the groups of sugar-beet growers and the groups of farmers there; they know perfectly well that they are going to get a good wage. They can tell them that they will have a good wage without guaranteeing 30 cents an hour.

LIMITATIONS IN JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO MEXICAN LABOR

Senator HAYDEN. I want to direct your attention, Mr. O'Neal, to lines 7 and 8 on page 5 which read:

> *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work,——

We will stop right there. If no part of this appropriation and no one working under it can do those things that are enumerated here, specifying that there should be a minimum wage or should be housing conditions or hours of work, then we do not make any agreement to import any labor from any foreign country.

I would like also to direct your attention to the language appearing on page 3, beginning in line 10, which states what the $12,500,000 is appropriated for and says,

and including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for the importation of workers from Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of his Act, but not to exceed a period of thirty days after the enactment of this Act. * * *

There is absolutely no guaranty that we could induce the Mexican Government in 30 days to do all those things, and so far as the agreement is concerned, in my judgment, and in the judgment of those interested in it in my State, we do not need any renegotiation at all. It is entirely satisfactory.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Would not that be interpreted as a condition raised by the Congress of the United States to the effect that we do not want any Mexicans imported, unless the Mexican Government would abandon the restrictions it has already imposed by agreement for the protection of its own citizens?

Senator HAYDEN. Reading the measure as a whole, I think that is a sound conclusion to draw.

Senator RUSSELL. They would undoubtedly draw that; and more than that, it strikes me that it involves the good faith of this country in dealing with a good neighbor, an ally in this war, because it repeals, by congressional action, an existing agreement.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Of course.

PROVISO RELATING TO AGRICULTURAL LABOR EXEMPTED UNDER FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT AND NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Senator HAYDEN. Now, as to the last part of this provision, appearing at the end of this joint resolution, which reads:

or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provision of sections 3 (f), 7 (c), and 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

That refers to a matter which is wholly domestic and has nothing to do with the importation of labor from Mexico, the West Indies, or any other place that may be involved. As a practical matter, I think you agree with me, Mr. O'Neal, that you could not expect laborers to be brought into the United States from any other country to work here for a period and expect to go back home, unless there was a definite understanding before they left their homes in a foreign country to come into the United States as to how much they were to receive.

Mr. O'NEAL. Senator Hayden, of course, you are a practical man and you are acquainted with these Mexicans; but I go back just to the fundamental sound economic philosophy and you know perfectly well that they are not going to come in here unless they know they can get the money and get paid. They never have, and they never will.

Now, the point that I am making is this: The House overwhelmingly is against the labor policies, contractual labor policies, with individual farmers.

Now, if the Government of the United States wants to do it there is no reason why they should not do it. They are doing it under Lend-Lease, and it is the thing that they are doing under B. E. W.

If the Government says to these fellows, "We will guarantee you so much to come on in," now, that is all right.

STATUS OF AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO UNDER HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96

Now, we realize the situation we are in. We do not want to throw that agreement out. I have talked with Cordell Hull about it. I have talked to the men who negotiated these treaties and so on. I think he needs to know frankly about some of these new men. I am going to tell him, because I think that they have got some pipe dreams up in their heads as to social philosophy—probably you men already know that—that are impracticable. Now, Cordell Hull is certainly not that type, and he is not aware that it is there; but the point is here that do you mean to tell me that the Government of the United States will do anything whereby—as Senator O'Mahoney indicates—there will be a declaration of war or they will throw out a treaty? We are not throwing out any treaty, Senator O'Mahoney, at all.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I did not say anything about a declaration of war, and I do not want you to put any language in my mouth.

Mr. O'NEAL. Let us take it out.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Now, you are a fast arguer. Now, what I said is clear, and nobody can deny it. You cannot deny it. Nobody can deny it, and I do not choose to have you put any language in my mouth.

Mr. O'NEAL. I thought that you indicated that.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Why, no.

Mr. O'NEAL. I am just dumb, then, that is all.

Senator O'MAHONEY. No; you are not dumb at all.

Mr. O'NEAL (interposing). You said——

Senator O'MAHONEY (continuing). You are a pretty good man at shifting your grounds whenever you want to.

Mr. O'NEAL. Well, you said so, did you not, Senator? You said that it was in violation of a treaty. Now, we do not want to violate any treaty; not at all. We——

Senator O'MAHONEY. I said nothing about a violation of a treaty.

Mr. O'NEAL. Excuse me then. I misunderstood you then.

The point I am making is this: This is a very practical problem we have got to meet here, and we know the situation in that area, Senator Russell, and the question that Senator Hayden raised was there is no reason why the Government of the United States could not protect those laborers; but the point is that the farmers of this Nation do not want that individual contract.

Senator OVERTON. This resolution does not undertake to violate any treaty.

Mr. O'NEAL. No; I do not think so.

Senator OVERTON. It simply says that the funds herein appropriated shall not be used for the purposes set forth in these agreements.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Let me read the language to which you refer.

Senator RUSSELL. On page 3.

Senator OVERTON. Pardon me for a moment. It is not my understanding that it attempts to set aside that treaty.

Senator RUSSELL. Read the language on page 3.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Right on that point, on that page——

Senator RUSSELL (continuing). On page 3. I would just like to correct Senator Overton's statement and say, in my opinion, there is something very definitely referring to the abrogation of the existing agreement, because on page 3 there is a specific congressional declaration to renounce this contract in accordance with this provision on page 5.

Senator OVERTON. That is as to any funds to be used for that purpose. It does not undertake to set aside the agreement at all.

Senator RUSSELL. The language used does, in my judgment, constitute a modification of the agreement. If it means anything, it means that with regard to the existing agreement. If it does not mean that, I do not understand what they are talking about.

Senator OVERTON. If the funds hereby appropriated are to be used, they are to be used as set forth in this resolution, which does not contemplate that they should be used in order to carry out those agreements; but the agreements are not set aside.

Senator RUSSELL. How would you construe the language on page 3, then, which direct them to renounce these contracts?

Senator OVERTON. In order to utilize these funds.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, of course.

Senator OVERTON. Well, that is all. We are controlling an appropriation that we are making for a specific purpose and we are not undertaking to set aside any agreement.

Senator RUSSELL. It says:

> until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this Act.

If that does not direct the Department to renegotiate the contract, why, I do not understand what the House is talking about.

Mr. O'NEAL. Senator Russell, excuse me for a minute. I do not mean to interrupt. The California people and Senator Hayden's group have been using and know about the Mexicans, and we have been discussing that provision here, and we drew up an amendment which we had finally agreed to on this, because there is that very deep-seated feeling that farmers do not want the wages and hours law. You see they use that; they have already used that Mexican importation provision; they use that with other labor in this country.

Senator HAYDEN. I agree 100 percent. It is entirely wrong.

Senator RUSSELL. I am in agreement with the position of the farmers on that; but I do not think that that is——

Mr. O'NEAL (interposing). Well cared for in here.

Senator RUSSELL. Takes care of that phase. I think it goes too far for that.

Mr. O'NEAL. You mean it is too drastic.

Senator RUSSELL. I do not believe that the United States Employment Service or the Federal Extension Service, or any other agency of the Government, can go down to Mexico and negotiate an agreement that does not mean something. As to what labor is going to be paid under this bill, they cannot do it.

Senator BANKHEAD. That is the existing contract?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes.

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I have a word? I want to call attention specifically to the language on page 3, and I will ask Mr. O'Neal to listen. The language begins in line 4.

Senator RUSSELL. You have a different copy of the bill, Mr. O'Neal.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Beginning in line 4 on page 3.

Senator RUSSELL. Line 4.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Beginning in line 4.

Mr. O'NEAL. I have that. Thank you.

PROVISO RELATING TO MODIFICATION OF EXISTING AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO

Senator O'MAHONEY. The language reads:

the remaining funds not to exceed $12,500,000 to be available as provided herein to carry out cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service for recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to State, and imported workers, including the payment of necessary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and protection of such workers while en route, and including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for the importation of workers from Mexico until—

Now here is the limitation:

until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this Act, but not to exceed a period of thirty days after the enactment of this Act.

Now, if I understand the English language the provision I read means that $12,500,000 is appropriated to carry out the existing agreements for the limited time. That time is limited by two factors: One, until the Government of the United States renegotiates an existing agreement with the Government of Mexico; or, two, for 30 days, if it is not renegotiated.

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

Senator O'MAHONEY. That means that 30 days after the enactment of this act, if that language remains in the act, and you come before this committee saying that none of this appropriation shall be available to import laborers from Mexico unless the United States can, within that 30 days, renegotiate the basis upon which the Mexican Government is now willing to permit those Mexican citizens to come into the United States.

In other words, you are saying——

Senator OVERTON (interposing). That is not in the agreement.

Senator O'MAHONEY (continuing).—we do not want workers from Mexico for the farms of the United States unless the Mexican Government agrees to reduce their compensation.

Mr. O'NEAL. I would not agree to that.

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is not what you mean?

Mr. O'NEAL. No; it is not.

Senator OVERTON. I would like to say something, Mr. Chairman.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I have not finished.

Senator OVERTON. You hold the floor much more than I do, and interrupt me, and please let me have the floor for a minute.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I beg your pardon.

Senator OVERTON. I am simply going to make an observation that this is not a rescission of any agreement between the United States and

Mexico. It is what I stated originally, a limitation upon appropriations.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You are quite right about that. I am saying that, too, but I want to find out what this witness wants.

It is not your desire to ask this committee to do that, is it?

Mr. O'NEAL. Our desire is, as rapidly as possible, to get rid of the present working arrangement under the Farm Security that has kept the labor out.

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is my understanding of what you want.

Senator BANKHEAD. Is there anything in this agreement or about this agreement put into the record in the House that you object to?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

Senator BANKHEAD. You want to terminate that agreement?

Mr. O'NEAL. In other words, we want to, just as rapidly as possible—if you want to put it at 90 days, all right, put it at 90 days.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Do you want that limitation to apply to the regulations imposed by the Government of Mexico or to the regulations imposed by the Farm Security?

Mr. O'NEAL. Regulations imposed by the Farm Security.

Senator O'MAHONEY. My whole point then is——

Mr. O'NEAL. What we are objecting to is——

Senator O'MAHONEY (continuing). The language which is presented here is an imposition on both.

AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO IMPORTATION OF FARM LABOR

Mr. O'NEAL. I do not know. I have not seen a copy of the treaty.

I might read you here what we have not finally agreed upon, but we have been discussing it, just to meet the situation that we are discussing here.

On page 5, line 24—that is the bill as it finally passed the House—after the colon insert the following:

: *Provided further*. That nothing herein shall prevent the Government of the United States itself through the agencies designated herein, giving proper assurance to foreign Governments that such workers shall not be discriminated against, nor from carrying out existing contracts with a foreign government, until such time as the existing contracts can be renegotiated in accordance with this Act, but during such period individual contracts between the Government of the United States and domestic agricultural employers shall not be required, and no provision of this Act or any existing law shall authorizes the War Manpower Commission, the War Labor Board, or the Director of Economic Stabilization, or any other agency of the Federal Government now existing or hereafter created to make applicable to agriculture any of the regulations, standards, or requirements which are prohibited hereunder:

The 30-day thing we might change that also, to meet that objection.

Now, we do not feel we are breaking any agreement with Mexico. I misinterpreted your statement there, and excuse me for it.

But, we want to just tide it over and get a new program working. But, we think it will work.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Evidently, since you propose this new agreement, you have yourself seen the objection which is apparent to me, when it was read for the first time to me this morning.

Mr. O'NEAL. Well, as a matter of fact, over in the House, as I remember the discussion from reading the record on the bill, this issue was not brought up.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes; it was brought up.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Dirksen on the floor said:

> It has been said that we are modifying the Mexican agreement. That is correct. And, the modification must be made within 30 days.

He was one of the sponsors of the resolution.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Who was that?

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Dirksen. He was one of the sponsors of the resolution.

Senator OVERTON. That is not a correct statement.

Senator RUSSELL. Of course it has that effect, Senator. That is a question of opinion. My opinion is that it absolutely invalidates the agreement.

Senator OVERTON. I know that the point is made that Congress should not undertake to modify an agreement. We do not undertake to modify an agreement.

Senator HAYDEN. Just make it so it will not work.

Senator OVERTON. We put this limitation on an appropriation. That is all.

Senator RUSSELL. We realize that we have no power to annul it by congressional declaration but we proceed then to fix it whereby it will be absolutely inoperative and invalid.

Senator TYDINGS. Has the State Department ever passed on this? I know of course they would be opposed to this language.

Mr. O'NEAL. Here is another provision we have discussed, and I think it will give a little further light. It ought to have been read before. We discussed it, and we had some pretty hot arguments, because there has been a great deal of feeling about this bill as you know, if you have watched the bill in the House and on this whole thing.

Here is another suggestion. We have not finally agreed on these things, but we have seen the difficulties of Senator Hayden down there. You are familiar with it down there in the Southwest and, we do not want to wreck a great fundamental program for labor all over the United States just due to conditions in one section of the country.

Senator HAYDEN. That is right.

Mr O'NEAL. We appreciate the amount of food that you produce. You do produce a lot of food; but it is confined to certain areas, and we wanted to do everything in God's world to help you, but we do not want to fasten a principle on agriculture that is foreign to American agriculture and all the rest of the United States because of your situation. In other words, we want to be broad minded and try to meet that situation, because you say that you just cannot get Mexicans in under any condition if this resolution is adopted. Then we would like to broaden it out so as to take care of your situation without surrendering any fundamental principles overwhelmingly adopted by the House in House Joint Resolution 96.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO PROVISION RELATING TO CARRYING OUT OF COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Now, on page 3, line 5, strike out all after the word "available" and all of lines 6 to 19, inclusive, and the first four words on line 20 and substitute therefor the following—it goes on to say there:

the remaining funds not to exceed $12,500,000 to be available—

Senator HAYDEN. Pardon me. What page is that?

Mr. O'NEAL. Page 3, line 5.

Then the proposed amendment goes on to say:

and paid to the Agricultural Extension Service in cooperation with the Extension Services of the Land-Grant Colleges in the respective States as herein specified, to carry out either through its own organization or by cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service or any State agency or agencies, including the allocation and payment of necessary funds, promptly and adequately notwithstanding any other provisions of law or regulation, the purposes and provisions of this Act, for recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to State, and imported workers, including the payment of necessary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and protection of such workers en route, and

Including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for a period not to exceed 30 days after the enactment of this Act for the importation of workers from Mexico and the Bahamas under existing agreements after which time, the agency designated herein shall take over and carry out these agreements until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Government of Mexico and the Government of the United States and the existing agreement between the Government of the Bahamas and the Government of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico and the Bahamas can be renegotiated in line with the policies and provisions of this Act and such negotiations shall be promptly undertaken.

Mr. O'NEAL. There is no time limit on that, you see. We are considering this; not approving.

Senator HAYDEN. Let me make this suggestion.

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. Undoubtedly, there is money enough already appropriated to carry on for 30 or 60 days, if the Farm Security Administration is required to do it. I don't think you need bother about that. Thus, I do not believe that part of the legislation is at all necessary.

REMOVING OF FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION FROM JURISDICTION OVER FARM LABOR PROGRAM

As I understand it, what you are primarily concerned with and what my folks are primarily concerned with is that they want to get rid of the hiring, the transportation, and the placement of labor by the Farm Security Administration. They want that work done through the United States Employment Service. That is what this bill provides.

Mr. O'NEAL. And the Extension Service.

Senator HAYDEN. With the money primarily appropriated to the Extension Service. I think we all agree that if there should be one head they should be the head, and that they should then call upon the United States Employment Service, where labor is to be transported

from one State to another or from a foreign country into the United States, to arrange the details of the transportation—to transfer funds to them to pay the railroad fare and to transfer funds to them to supervise the work.

If that is done you have accomplished all that you have desired. You get rid completely and utterly of the Farm Security Administration. That is really what you want to do, isn't it?

Mr. O'NEAL. We would go further than that. If the Farm Security Administration had done any good with it we would not be kicking. But they haven't done any good, and it has failed.

The point I am making, Senator, is this: There is a principle involved, underneath it all. We don't want to force the farmer to make a contract and say he has to pay this and that and the other.

Senator HAYDEN. That is another point.

Mr. O'NEAL. The American farmers don't want it. You may want it out in that country; but, by George, they don't want it anywhere else.

Senator HAYDEN. Let us get that clear. I don't think there is any issue at all between the farmers in California and New Mexico and Texas, and there is no issue between the farmers who grow beets up in the Northwest or who harvest cane in Louisiana. Where they have to bring in people from one State to another, where they all have identically the same problem, and wherever migratory labor has to move from one part of the United States to another, the problem is identical and there is no difference in principle.

ASSURANCES AS TO WAGES TO BE PAID FARM LABOR MOVED FROM ONE STATE TO ANOTHER

The sole question is, Can you get a laborer to move from one part of the United States to another part of the United States without telling him what you are going to give him before he goes? Can you do that?

Mr. O'NEAL. You can tell him you will pay him the prevailing wage. I just won't pin you on that one.

Senator HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. How about the wage-and-hour law? You guarantee him 30 cents and he works 40 hours, but he knows he is going to get more than that, and he gets it. In other words, there is a competitive basis there for labor. They tell me—and you have had witnesses on it and know it—that they often make two or three times the prevailing wage.

Senator HAYDEN. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. O'NEAL. But we are saying it can be done without having the contractual relation with the farmer. That is the thing.

Senator HAYDEN. I am not going to argue about that. That is another question entirely. But as far as the Mexican labor is concerned, the primary purpose you seek to accomplish in this legislation is that it shall not be handled by the Farm Security Administration; and, second, as far as any interstate transportation of labor is concerned, it shall not be handled by the Farm Security Administration. That is No. 1.

The second question we debated here yesterday with the Secretary of Agriculture is this: If the Federal Government is to guarantee to the worker, when he is transported from one part of the United States to another, that he is to get certain wages, then the Government has to be in a position to pay him those wages if he doesn't get them.

Do you want us to appropriate money and make it available out of the Treasury—and there is nothing in this bill to that effect—that would make it possible to pay a worker, who is brought from, say, Texas to North Dakota to harvest wheat, if he didn't get the pay he expected when he was told the Government would pay him or see that he was paid?

Mr. O'NEAL. No; we don't want to go that far. Senator Hayden, this proposition is all a practical one. It isn't a theoretical matter. You don't move men a thousand miles on theory. In other words, you know yourself in your own country it has worked out. A cotton grower will say, "Yes; we will give these fellows $2 a hundred pounds for picking cotton."

Senator HAYDEN. That is right.

Mr. O'NEAL. We are splitting hairs here about a fundamental thing. I want to go beyond that and correct any wrong impression I may have given. On this labor problem, the Farm Bureau is 1,000 percent for Senator Tydings' bill and 1,000 percent for Senator Bankhead's bill, and we are going to have to have something like this. This is a fundamental problem of America. Let us not get confused by talking entirely about Mexican labor. Please let me plead with you, don't get confused with the big issue of food production we have in America.

Senator TYDINGS. Suppose a Federal agent, either in the United States or in Mexico, talks to a group of prospective farm laborers and asks them whether they will go to a certain State where there is a need for them. I would imagine that the foreign or the local laborers would ask the Federal agent, "Where do you want us to go, and how much will our pay be when we get there?"

Then the Federal agent would say, "The rate in Maryland, or Arizona, or South Dakota is so much a day for 8 hours, or it is piecework for so much a pound or basket or hamper."

Then the laborer, whether he be a Mexican or in one of the States, makes his decision as to whether or not he wants to go there at that wage. He may ask about other conditions, for instance, whether his transportation will be provided home.

But your proposition is that you don't want the individual farmer to make a contract with somebody he hasn't seen, whose working ability he doesn't know about, and who will put him over the barrel? What you want is for the prevailing wage in that community to be told to the prospective worker so that he can make his decision whether or not he wants to come, and you want it to stop there? You don't want the Government to guarantee him that, or the other man to guarantee him that; but you do want the Government to tell him that if he will go there and work at that particular job, he will get so much, which is the prevailing wage in the community? And that is as far as you want to go, and that is all you want in the law?

Mr. O'NEAL. I had the pleasure of having dinner the other day with one of the largest employers of labor in America, the biggest vineyardist and with the largest winery in the United States. He said

he got a lot of Mexicans over and thought they were going to work. The first day he went out to his ranch and didn't see them at work. They had all struck; they wanted beef to eat. So he told his bosses, "Boys, we have plenty of beef in the cooler down here. Let's devote 1 day to 300 Mexicans and fill them up with beef so that it will ooze out of their ears"—which they did, and he had no more trouble with the Mexicans.

Senator HOLMAN. That is very interesting.

Senator TYDINGS. Let me ask one more question.

Senator HOLMAN. But I want an answer to your first question.

Senator TYDINGS. Just a minute; let me put this question.

Senator HOLMAN. Before you do that, I want an answer to the first question; you haven't got it yet.

Senator TYDINGS. Let me ask you how many times men have left, either Mexico or in the United States, and come to the place where they were needed, where what was promised them was not lived up to?

Mr. O'NEAL. Well, Senator Tydings, I don't know, and I think Senator Hayden could answer you on that. But I will say this, that I know men who have worked Mexicans many, many years, and they are worked up as far as Michigan, and some in Ohio and Indiana.

Senator TYDINGS. Was there an abuse or a failure to live up to what was promised?

Mr. O'NEAL. I don't think there has been.

Senator TYDINGS. Excuse me, Senator Holman; I just wanted that tied onto my question.

Mr. O'NEAL. All we have to do is go back to Mexico and see how much better off they are here than in Mexico; and look at what he has here and what the fellow has who didn't come.

Senator HOLMAN. Senator Tydings stated the proposition so that I understood his question perfectly; but I have not heard your reply. Did Senator Tydings interpret your position correctly, or not?

Mr. O'NEAL. I think he did there.

We offered, Senator Holman, some amendments here that we haven't finally agreed to, that would have the Government agency guarantee them something there, and give them some protection, without having the guarantee directly between the employer and the man. I don't know whether you could work it out. Senator Hayden knows, probably. I think they did with the sugar beets, didn't they, Senator Hayden? Don't those sugar beet corporations you have out there put up so much money?

Senator HAYDEN. We don't have any sugar beet corporations; but Senator O'Mahoney would know.

Mr. O'NEAL. Senator O'Mahoney, don't the growers out in your country say, "We want so many Mexicans and guarantee to pay them so much, and will take a certain responsibility for them?"—in other words, without going down to the 30 cents an hour, and so many days?

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. O'NEAL. It is just a common, horse-sense business.

Senator TYDINGS. You want it so that what the man is promised when he leaves wherever he is, he gets at least that much?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

AMOUNT OF FUNDS FOR SECURING MEXICAN LABOR

Senator LODGE. Mr. O'Neal, of the 65 million to be appropriated here, about how much of that would go to the getting of Mexican labor?

Mr. O'NEAL. We didn't recommend 65 million, but 26 million; and it is broken down in the bill there, so much for imported labor and so much for domestic labor—13½ million for the domestic and 12½ for the other.

Senator HAYDEN. No; that couldn't be possible.

Senator RUSSELL. That is also for interstate labor.

Mr. O'NEAL. No; it is migrant labor.

Senator LODGE. So you say about half of it is for foreign labor?

Mr. O'NEAL. No; it is migrant labor.

Senator LODGE. How much of it is interstate?

Senator TYDINGS. You want to know how much is for each?

Senator LODGE. Yes.

Senator HAYDEN. It was estimated normally there was a migration of some half-million workers who followed the crops inside the United States. Senator Tydings developed yesterday that the Department hoped with this money perhaps to move a quarter of a million from one State to another. The maximum number obtainable under the Mexican agreement is 50,000, and they actually have not obtained 10,000.

WHERE FUNDS WILL BE SPENT AND CROPS INVOLVED

Senator LODGE. I want to get to the interests behind this and where it will be spent and the crops it is to be used on.

Mr. O'NEAL. The bill says according to needs. In other words, if Massachusetts needs a certain amount——

Senator LODGE (interposing). You don't expect much of it to be spent in Massachusetts do you?

Mr. O'NEAL. No; and I don't know that much of it will be spent in Alabama.

Senator LODGE. Where do you expect it will be spent?

Mr. O'NEAL. Well, as Senator Hayden says, I think the Budget set-up was for 50,000 Mexicans, and he answered it by saying they had gotten—how many?

Senator HAYDEN. I said they haven't gotten 10,000 yet.

Mr. O'NEAL. In other words, a lot of it will be spent on the Bahamas, I understand, going to Florida and into the Carolinas, in the fruits and vegetables.

Senator LODGE. All right; that is as far as the Carolinas. Where else? I am trying to find out where this money is going to go.

Mr. O'NEAL. As I said here, 90 percent of it is within the States.

Senator LODGE. Within what States?

Mr. O'NEAL. Within all the States. In other words, there will be the high school children.

Senator LODGE. Ninety percent of this appropriation of 26 million is going to be spent among all the 48 States?

Mr. O'NEAL. Ninety percent of the people will be handled within the States, within the United States. About 10 percent are the Bahamians and the Mexicans.

Senator LODGE. I understand that. If you don't want to, Mr. O'Neal, you don't have to say. I am not trying to embarrass anybody.

Mr. O'NEAL. Oh, no.

Senator TYDINGS. Let me see if I can clear it up. Senator Lodge doesn't want to know where the labor is coming from, but what States will be benefited by this money.

Senator OVERTON. By the importation of the foreign labor.

Mr. O'NEAL. They will be benefited by the importation of foreign labor in those States where they have these truck crops. And they are training the high school children and have done some very excellent jobs in certain areas. In the East, in your country, I think they have trained a lot of women there to go out and work on the farm.

Senator LODGE. That isn't answering my question at all. I guess I can't speak English.

Mr. O'NEAL. Well, I can't tell exactly; I don't know.

Senator LODGE. I know you can't tell me exactly; but what is your guess? I am not trying to bother anybody or harass anybody.

WHERE IMPORTED LABOR IS TO BE USED

Senator NYE. Can't we break down the question and see if Mr. O'Neal can't say where the imported labor is to be used?

Mr. O'NEAL. California, New Mexico, Arizona, Texas; that is the Mexican labor. I don't see very much sense in hauling Mexican labor across the United States. I should say it would go just down there. Senator Hayden will tell you where it is used there.

Senator NYE. Incidentally, we do get some Mexican labor in the sugar beet farms up north.

Mr. O'NEAL. I understand those Mexicans are so pleased over here they don't want to go home. I imagine Senator O'Mahoney can answer that.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Some of them stay there.

WHERE LABOR MOVED FROM STATE TO STATE WILL BE USED

Senator TYDINGS. Aside from the foreign labor, including the Bahamans coming to Florida, the actual migratory labor, I understand, will be used in Florida, Georgia, the Carolinas, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New York; and that the migratory labor coming from or originating in, say, Louisiana will migrate up the Mississippi; and the other labor, up in the wheat fields farther west, and in the cattle country of Wyoming, North and South Dakota, and Minnesota. Is that the plan?

Mr. O'NEAL. That is the plan. In other words, if they can train them a little bit and move them around—that is going to be the problem.

Senator LODGE. Will they be used for sugar beets, primarily?

Mr. O'NEAL. Sugar beets and vegetables. We can put in the records to show the heavy losses in those crops.

Senator RUSSELL. At page 42 of the House hearings Major Walker inserted a table undertaking to break the project down as to where they expected to take the farm workers.

Senator LODGE. Thank you.

Senator OVERTON. Mr. O'Neal, have you any objection to the provisions contained in the House bill with reference to the importation of Mexican and other foreign labor?

Mr. O'NEAL. I have none there.

SUGGESTION THAT EXTRA COMPENSATION TO LABORERS BE PAID BY THE GOVERNMENT

Senator OVERTON. You have made one suggestion to which there probably wouldn't be so much objection, that if there was obviated the necessity of contractual relations between the farmer who does the employing and the laborer who is imported, and some extra money is to be paid to the imported laborer, the Government would pay it.

But, on the other hand, you did make the statement that you were not so very much sold on that idea.

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

Senator OVERTON. The idea of the Federal Government making the contribution, in order to guarantee wages and hours and so forth.

Mr. O'NEAL. No; we are opposed to that. In other words, we would like to do it, according to the economic laws, with safeguards to working people.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY CONFERENCE OF GOVERNORS

I might say this, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Senate, that this matter was discussed at that famous governors' meeting at Des Moines, held last week, and the governors from 12 or 14 Corn Belt States endorsed this bill.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *March 23, 1943.*

EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation, Washington, D. C.

Following resolution adopted Conference of Governors, Des Moines, March 15, in view of the fact that labor is one of the limiting factors of the 1943 food-production program, and whereas there has been before the Appropriation Committee of the House of Representatives a bill appropriating $26,000,000 to be expended by the Extension Service in the recruiting, housing, training, and placement of agricultural workers and said appropriation has been approved by the committee and voted out by the recommendation that it be passed: therefore be it

Resolved by this conference, That approval of this measure be given and that all members of Congress from the 12 States here represented be urged to support this measure.

HOWARD LEONARD,
Director, Illinois State Department of Agriculture.

INTERPRETATION OF SUGGESTED AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO IMPORTATION OF LABOR

Senator O'MAHONEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a few questions?

Senator RUSSELL. Surely.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I have here the amendment which has been proposed by Mr. O'Neal, and the questions I ask are not intended to be argumentative; they are intended to elicit the purpose of the amendment. Let us see what is intended to be done by it. Do you have it before you, Mr. O'Neal?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes, sir; there are two of them here.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You propose to strike out the language on page 3, beginning after the word "available" on line 5, down through and including everything to the word "act" in line 20, as I understand it.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is right.

Senator O'MAHONEY. And you are going to substitute language, which you have already read into the record and which it will be unnecessary for me to read in extenso.

Mr. O'NEAL. We have not—I said this, Senator—I beg your pardon—that we were discussing that with the southwesterners to see if we could get an agreement. We haven't finally approved this. It is what you might call a proposed compromise.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Then you don't offer this yet?

Mr. O'NEAL. No; we don't offer it yet.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Then let us see what it would mean, if it were offered.

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes; I would like to have your suggestions.

ELIMINATION OF FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION FROM PROGRAM

Senator O'MAHONEY. It provides this sum of $12,500,000 shall be available. Then down in the middle of this proposed amendment, "including also such funds"—do you see where I am reading?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes, sir.

Senator O'MAHONEY (reading)—

as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for a period not to exceed 30 days after the enactment of this act for the importation of workers from Mexico and the Bahamas under existing agreements—

Now stopping there.

Do you mean by that to provide that the appropriation here made shall be available for the Farm Security Administration to carry out existing agreements for 30 days only?

Mr. O'NEAL. For 30 days, that is right.

Senator O'MAHONEY. And after 30 days, the Farm Security Administration is out?

Mr. O'NEAL. Some other agency then takes it over.

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is clear, then, that you mean by that that after 30 days, Farm Security Administration is out, and its power to carry out existing agreements will end at that time?

Mr. O'NEAL. That is right. Some other agency will take over.

RENEGOTIATION OF AGREEMENTS

Senator O'MAHONEY. Then we continue:

after which time—

that is to say, after the expiration of the 30 days—

the agency designated herein—

which is the Extension Service?

Mr. O'NEAL. Or the employment agency.

Senator O'MAHONEY (reading):

shall take over and carry out these agreements until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Government of Mexico and

the Government of the United States and the existing agreement between the Government of the Bahamas and the Government of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico and the Bahamas can be renegotiated in line with the policies and provisions of this act and such negotiations shall be promptly undertaken.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is right.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Do you mean by that to declare that appropriate modifications should be made in these agreements?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes; that is what the language says—if possible to do it.

QUESTION AS TO MODIFICATIONS IN AGREEMENTS THAT ARE SUGGESTED

Senator O'MAHONEY. Yes. What modifications do you believe to be appropriate?

Mr. O'NEAL. To follow out the policy laid down in this bill here.

Senator O'MAHONEY. But do I understand from what you have already testified, that your purpose is merely to eliminate individual contracts between the farmer and the workers?

Mr. O'NEAL. Not all, but one. Wage-and-hour regulations; in other words, do away with that provision that sets forth in the law here. In other words, if that is in the agreement, we want it out of there.

Senator O'MAHONEY. If the Government of the United States has entered into an agreement with the Government of Mexico, binding this Government to any course of action with respect to imported laborers contrary to the specifications set forth in this act, you would like to have that modification renegotiated?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes, sir.

HOW NEGOTIATIONS WOULD BE CARRIED OUT

Senator O'MAHONEY. And then the last phrase [reading]:

and such negotiations shall be promptly undertaken.

How do you expect to carry that out?

Mr. O'NEAL. Well, after enacting this bill, just have the State Department notify the Mexican Government that here is the agency we have designated to do this job, and then let us negotiate with the Mexican Government for the key agency handling the proposition.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I have never seen the copy of the agreement with Mexico, or a copy of the agreement with the Bahamas.

Mr. O'NEAL. It is in the House hearings, Senator.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I wonder if it would be possible for you to take that agreement and mark in it the provisions which you would like to see modified.

Mr. O'NEAL. We thought in this bill, of course, that was taken care of; but we will be glad to try to do it.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Can you do that, Mr. Ogg?

PROVISION WAS INTENDED TO PROHIBIT AGENCIES FROM IMPOSING WAGE AND HOUR AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING REQUIREMENTS ON FARMS

Mr. OGG. I doubt if that is practical. As we see it this is a matter of negotiation and bargaining between two Governments. And as I understand the purpose here, it was for Congress to indicate its policy

with respect to agricultural labor, and to stop Government agencies from imposing by law or by regulation wage-and-hour and collective-bargaining requirements from which farmers are exempted by existing law.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I quite agree the agency should not be permitted to impose new conditions by regulation which have not been authorized by Congress.

Mr. OGG. That is the whole purpose.

Senator O'MAHONEY. But that falls into a different category from renegotiating with the Government of a foreign country, and demanding that that Government abandon any conditions that it has imposed.

Mr. OGG. I think I can clear this whole thing up, Senator, if you will allow me to proceed a little further in answer to your question.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Surely.

Mr. OGG. The Congress of the United States has specifically exempted agricultural labor from wage and hour regulations, and from collective-bargaining requirements, by law. Now, acting under the war power, the Government has imposed, not just upon the Mexican workers, but by reason of the fact that the Farm Security Administration signed this agreement, and others, with Mexico, agreeing to a lot of standards, that has been used as a pretext to force upon all American agriculture a far-reaching program of regulation of agricultural labor. They have said to the farmer:

> The Federal Government is not going to help you get any labor from State to State—domestic labor, if you please—or imported labor, unless you sign a contract with the Farm Security Administration, in which you agree to whatever wages they find and whatever hours they prescribe—

And so on.

Now, the purpose of this bill is to free the farmer from regulations we believe, if not illegal, are certainly contrary to the policies Congress has established. And our suggestion which we presented here we believe would still enable the Government to properly safeguard farm workers. Congress would declare its policy; and then ask the State Department to attempt, by negotiation with the Government of Mexico, to try to work out an amendment to this agreement which would be in accord with that policy.

And we believe, Senator, that all of the essential standards the workers or the Government of Mexico could properly ask for in the way of wages and in the way of conditions of work and housing, could all be met by our Government under this bill (H. J. Res. 96); that our Government could give every assurance that the Government or the people of Mexico require, and could carry out these assurances under this bill without fixing by regulation minimum wages and hours, or without requiring the farmer to sign a contract. We believe that could all be done, for this reason, that the agency that brings this labor in is going to have money available to it to transport these workers. The farmer will file his order with the county agent, we will say, in a county, that "I want so many Mexican workers, to do certain work, for a certain period. I am willing to pay so much, and I have certain housing."

If the county agent finds those wages are below the going rates in the community, and the farmer hasn't adequate housing, he simply doesn't place that labor with that farmer and doesn't fill his order.

That is the essential difference between House Joint Resolution 96 and the present agreement. Instead of forcing something on every farmer by law or regulation, we believe this thing could be handled in a sensible and practical way.

REQUIREMENT IN AGREEMENT THAT CONTRACTS BE MADE BETWEEN EMPLOYER AND THE WORKER UNDER SUPERVISION OF MEXICAN GOVERNMENT

Senator O'MAHONEY. I find in the agreement this clause, appearing on page 52 of the House hearings, under the heading "Contracts"—and this is a part of the agreement between the United States and Mexico:

> Contracts will be made between the employer and the worker under the supervision of the Mexican Government.

and then in parentheses:

> (Contracts must be written in Spanish.)

Mr. OGG. May I say in reference to that?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. OGG. That we believe if the Government of the United States enters into an agreement with the Government of Mexico that it will not permit their workers who are imported to be discriminated against by receiving wages less than are paid our own workers for the same work in the same community, we believe that is a more effective guaranty to the Government of Mexico than any agreement of any individual citizen. Therefore, we think the contract with the individual farmer is unnecessary.

RECOMMENDATION FOR ELIMINATION FROM MEXICAN AGREEMENT OF REQUIREMENT THAT CONTRACTS BE MADE BETWEEN EMPLOYER AND THE WORKER

Senator O'MAHONEY. Then that leads to the purpose of my reading that. Is it your position that this committee should recommend to the Senate that this contract or agreement between the United States and Mexico should be modified by the elimination of that clause?

Mr. OGG. Yes.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Well.

Mr. OGG. That is one thing.

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is precisely what I wanted to get at.

Senator HAYDEN. That, of course, presents a very serious problem as far as the importation of foreign labor is concerned, because there are two parties to it. The objection my farmers had was never to the Mexican agreement as such. They said:

> If we could get labor out of Mexico under the Mexican conditions, and the conditions were such that we could comply with them and make a profit, we will take it that way, and that is all right with us.

OBJECTION HAS BEEN TO APPLYING TERMS OF MEXICAN AGREEMENT TO DOMESTIC FARM LABOR

But they violently object to the assumption on the part of the Department of Agriculture that, having made this agreement with the Government of Mexico, we couldn't do less for American labor; and, therefore, all the Mexican conditions shall be imposed upon interstate labor brought from one part of the United States to another. That is where the violent objection arises. There never has been, on the part of any employer of Mexican labor, any demand, so far as I know, that the Mexican agreement as written should be changed.

(A discussion followed off the record.)

EFFECT OF PROVISION PERTAINING TO RENEGOTIATION OF AGREEMENTS

Senator OVERTON. It seems to me under your second amendment that what you provide is that Congress, if it adopts this amendment, will authorize the execution of these agreements that now exist between the Mexican Government and the United States, and the Bahamas and the United States, to which you are now objecting; that they can continue until you are able to renegotiate some other agreement. If the United States Government is unable to negotiate another agreement, then we direct the Federal Government to carry on these agreements to which you are objecting.

Senator RUSSELL. And that confirms the expression of policy.

Senator OVERTON. It is simply a request, then, on the part of Congress that the Federal Government undertake a renegotiation of the agreement; and if it fails, to go on, though, and carry out the agreement.

Mr. OGG. I am not certain of that.

Senator OVERTON. Then let us read it. Here is what it says.

Mr. O'NEAL. Perhaps we had better change it.

Senator OVERTON. We all understand that "30 days." Then it says:

after which time—

that is, after the 30 days—

the agency designated herein shall take over and carry out these agreements—

being the agreements between the United States and Mexico, and between the United States and the Bahamas—

until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Government of Mexico and the Government of the United States and the existing agreement between the Government of the Bahamas and the Government of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico and the Bahamas can be renegotiated in line with the policies and provisions of this act and such negotiations shall be promptly undertaken.

It is the "promptly undertaken" that is the request of Congress, if this amendment is adopted, to undertake such negotiations. But if you fail, go on with the agreements and keep on executing these agreements. That is exactly what it means.

I understood from the statement of Mr. O'Neal that he is objecting, that the Farm Bureau is objecting, to these agreements and the con-

tinuance of these agreements. And that is the reason why I asked him if he wasn't satisfied with the House provision of the bill just as it stands.

Mr. O'NEAL. You see, we have devoted 95 percent of the time to talking about Mexicans, when the major problem is the 3,000,000 workers we must recruit in this country.

STATEMENT OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to put in the record the statement by the chairman of the executive committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, where they declare their willingness to cooperate in this program.

Senator RUSSELL. Very well; turn it over to the reporter.

(The statement follows:)

MEMORANDUM OF ACTION TAKEN BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES—MARCH 5 AND 6, 1943

The executive committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities at their meeting on March 5 and 6, 1943, discussed at length the problem of securing a farm labor supply to assist the food-production program for 1943. The executive committee also studied and discussed the various proposals of the Secretary of Agriculture, the farm organization, and the Congress for meeting this acute farm-labor shortage. The committee believes that a feasible, workable plan should be adopted at the earliest possible date, as crops are already being planted in many States, and any program developed at this late date will barely be able to meet the needs in even the northern dairy and Corn Belt States.

The land-grant colleges through their agricultural extension services do not seek responsibility for supervising the farm-labor program, but if it is the will of Congress the Extension Service should undertake such a program; then the executive committee, in view of the emergency, pledges the full cooperation of the land-grant colleges through the Extension Service and providing adequate appropriations are made to implement this program will accept responsibility for:

1. Mobilizing and placing all available labor within the county, including experienced farm labor, high-school students in cooperation with the school, volunteer businessmen, women, and others.

2. Transporting, housing, placing, and supervising migratory labor within the State in cooperation with the United States Employment Service or other agency designated by Congress.

3. Cooperating with the United States Employment Service or other agency designated by Congress in placing, housing, and supervising migratory labor from without the State who will be recruited and transported by the designated agency.

Federal appropriations made to the extension services for this program should be allotted to the States without necessity of offset.

The above statement was approved by the executive committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in regular meeting on March 5 and 6, 1943, in Washington, D. C.

T. O. WALTON,
Chairman of Executive Committee.

Mr. O'NEAL. With that, I am very much obliged to you gentlemen, and I have three other witnesses here.

This Dr. Simons, of New York, of the State extension service, at Cornell University. Where this thing we are discussing is so theoretical and so technical and diplomatic, and what not, he is making the program work, in that great State of New York. I would like for you to hear him.

Senator RUSSELL. All right. Come around, Dr. Simons; we will be glad to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF DR. L. R. SIMONS, DIRECTOR OF EXTENSION, NEW YORK STATE

QUESTION OF APPLYING PROGRAM TO ALL STATES

Dr. SIMONS. I should like to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that no national pattern in this farm-labor program can apply to all of the States. The conditions in every State, as you know, are different. In my conversations and communications with directors of extension widely scattered over the country, I know that practically every State has undertaken a program, for some months past, to relieve this farm labor shortage. It varies according to the State and the facilities and the personnel they have to operate with.

The point I want to make is that there can be no Federal program set down as a pattern for each State. Each State has to work out its own solution to this problem, and I should like to illustrate this by our own State, briefly.

ORGANIZATION IN NEW YORK OF COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FARM LABOR SHORTAGE

We started in July, 1940, to try to meet what we expected to be a farm-labor shortage. At that time, no one else seemed to realize we were going to get into this situation. So we set up an agricultural defense committee, made up of the heads of the important farm organizations of the State, plus farmer representatives of Federal agencies including the triple A, F. S. A., F. C. S., Production Credit, and Land Use—making a total State committee of 14. That committee has been operating, now, since July, 1940.

SCOPE OF COMMITTEE'S ACTIVITIES

Senator RUSSELL. What is the scope of their activities?

Dr. SIMONS. They work primarily on the farm-labor situation and to help farmers relieve this farm labor shortage through a farm machinery repair and maintenance program.

Senator HAYDEN. I notice on page 4 of the bill it provides as follows [reading]:

> That the extension services of the land-grant colleges shall be responsible for the recruiting, training, transportation, and placement of all such workers within their respective States; and the Extension Service is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services, and to cooperate with any other public or private agency.

You have created in New York this particular agency you have described.

COMMITTEE IS POLICY-MAKING ORGANIZATION

Dr. SIMONS. Pardon me, Senator; I have to follow on just a little bit with that. This is a policy-making committee. It has since become a

part of the New York State War Council, that is, the agricultural committee of the New York State War Council, which determines agricultural policies for the State of New York during wartime.

Senator HAYDEN. The point I was trying to get at was that the bill contemplates cooperation with agencies such as you have described.

Dr. SIMONS. That is right.

ACTION OF CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

[See p. 94]

Senator HAYDEN. I have here a column from the New York Times, of Sunday, which states that the California Legislature, realizing the crisis existing in the State, has created by law a farm production council, with provision for a labor placement agency.

BILL SHOULD PROVIDE FOR COOPERATION WITH AGENCIES SET UP BY STATES TO DEAL WITH FARM LABOR

If this bill before us doesn't so provide, we want to be sure it does authorize cooperation with the States, and not necessarily with just the land-grant colleges.

Dr. SIMONS. That is right.

Senator HAYDEN. But with any other agency of the States set up in these times to meet the acute needs for agricultural labor.

FARM LABOR TECHICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN NEW YORK

Dr. SIMONS. We have also, as a subcommittee of this farm committee, what is known as the farm labor technical advisory committee, made up of professional workers from the extension service, the State education department regarding high school labor boys and girls, the triple A, the Farm Security Administration, and the Employment Service. We have worked as a team now for a long time in coordinating this whole program under this farmer committee. Each has a job to do, and we do that job, we think, as well as we can with what facilities we have. In other words, there is no attempt for any agency in this plan to try to get credit for the whole program. That hasn't been the idea at all; but it has been an attempt to try to coordinate all these activities under one head and get a solution as near as we can to the problem.

ORGANIZATION WITHIN COUNTIES IN NEW YORK

The same thing is set up in the counties, the county agricultural defense committee, with similar personnel, representing the farm organizations and the action agencies, if they have a farmer committee there.

Senator RUSSELL. Does each county have a committee of 14, then?

Dr. SIMONS. Not necessarily 14, because some of these agencies may not be there; but they follow about the same pattern. In the county, the county agricultural agent is the secretary of this committee and he operates as any executive secretary would operate. He is really more the coordinator and the man who carries out the wishes of this committee, with the help of the other agencies.

NATURE OF WORKING RELATIONS WITH UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

We have had very fine working relations with the Employment Service. They have a farm-placement man in the State and will have one in practically each one of the counties, that they are paying for. The county agricultural agent, with the agricultural defense committee, selects the man. They place this man either in their own office, if they have one, or in the county agent's office, depending upon where the farmers would go most, you see, where it is more of a central point. They will continue to operate, they tell me, on that basis until these funds come through, or at least up to the 1st of July.

We propose, if this money is made available to us, to continue the same plan, and use the same men and operate just as we are now, except that actually we could pay these men.

EMPLOYEES PAID BY UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Senator RUSSELL. The Employment Service is paying these men out of their appropriation?

Dr. SIMONS. Yes, sir. I suppose that will not continue after the 1st of July. They are trying to get together all the funds they can for this purpose, because they realize this is one of the most important problems they have to meet.

ESTIMATE SUBMITTED TO BUDGET BUREAU BY EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Senator HAYDEN. The information I have is that the Employment Service submitted to the Budget an estimate for increased funds to carry on this work; but the problem was studied by the Bureau of the Budget and that idea was scrapped in favor of this estimate of $65,000,000 sent to Congress, whereby the entire work would be undertaken by the Department of Agriculture.

QUESTION AS TO WHETHER APPROPRIATION PROVIDED BY HOUSE WOULD BE SUFFICIENT

Senator RUSSELL. That is the question which arises in my mind, whether this appropriation would be adequate to carry out a program within the States. $13,000,000 won't go very far, if you have a man in each one of the counties.

Senator HAYDEN. That is a question, again, the House answered by saying, "We will try it out, and if further funds are needed later, they can get them through further appropriations."

EXISTING ORGANIZATIONS IN STATES SHOULD BE UTILIZED

Dr. SIMONS. Mr. Chairman, I would say every State is trying to meet this situation the best they can, with the facilities and the personnel they have available now; and whatever legislation is passed, it seems to me, should fit into the State pattern, and not set up something new, but use what they have now.

Senator HAYDEN. I think you have made a very important point.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CALIFORNIA FARM PRODUCTION COUNCIL

Senator HAYDEN. For the record, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask to have printed a section taken out of the dispatch to the New York Times of Sunday, March 21, with respect to the action recently taken by the California legislature in establishing the California Farm Production Council.

(The excerpt follows:)

The bill established a California Farm Production Council of seven members representing agriculture and appointed by the Governor, subject to Senate confirmation. Also provided for is a State farm production director, with county agencies cooperating. The State will assist financially in the recruitment of farm labor.

The State director, under the plan, will provide for the recruiting, placement, transportation, housing, and sustenance of farm labor, and the farm production commmittees and county coordinators are expected to fit into the State pattern their own local production programs. They are to help see that agricultural labor is moved from one part of California to another as it is needed.

Provision likewise is made for the employment of school children under proper supervision in the harvesting of crops. State and local agencies will set up camps for the workers.

REPAIRS ARE PROVIDED FOR

With an appropriation of $1,500,000 the State Farm Production Council will have the authority to obtain parts, where possible, for the repair of farm machinery.

4–H CLUBS INCLUDED IN NEW YORK STATE PROGRAM

Senator RUSSELL. I am very much interested in the program, and I want it developed as fully as possible. Did you have anyone representing the 4–H clubs, or the vocational education?

Dr. SIMONS. Yes; we have in our State a federation, the same as our farm bureau federation, representing the adults supervising the work of the 4–H clubs, which is called in New York State the 4–H Extension Federation. The president of that federation is a member of this committee on the State level, and there is a similar representative on the county level. We have, also, one of our 4–H leaders on this technical committee of which I have spoken—the Farm Technical Labor Advisory Committee—so that 4–H is taken care of in that way.

LARGEST SUPPLY OF FARM LABOR MUST BE OBTAINED LOCALLY

Senator RUSSELL. As I see your problem, it will be necessary to get at least 90 to 95 percent of the labor within the area where the work is going to be done. And when we are talking about bringing in five or six thousand Bahamians, that isn't a drop in the bucket. It occurs to me the best source we are going to have is to utilize as far as possible the high-school students, who can at least harvest the crops.

They can't make the crops, but they can help harvest them, if we can get it organized.

FARM CADET VICTORY CORPS IN NEW YORK

Dr. SIMONS. We have organized in our State, Senator, the Farm Cadet Victory Corps, which operates on a fund appropriated by the legislature through the State War Council.

Senator RUSSELL. How is that set up?

Dr. SIMONS. It is set up through the State educational department, which has a representative on the Farm Labor Technical Committee. It is all coordinated through one program. The State educational department has this fund with which to transport, supervise, and protect high-school workers in camps and on farms, as that seems necessary.

Senator RUSSELL. How is the corps organized? Are they organized in companies, or other units, that they may exert a psychological appeal?

Dr. SIMONS. They haven't gone into it to that extent. We haven't attempted to make any big display of organization, but just to have it as simple as possible. Through that organization, and through other effort, we estimate 40,000 boys and girls were used last year on the farms, and very satisfactorily. We anticipate there will be many more this year.

PROGRAM FOR ORGANIZING STUDENTS

The 4–H group is also working on this. They are working very closely with the schools, and they have attempted in every way to make these boys feel at home when they get out in the communities, taking them into their clubs temporarily and making them feel they are part of the community when they get out there. That has been their principal part in connection with this program.

IMPORTANCE OF OBTAINING SERVICES OF HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

Senator RUSSELL. As you well stated, it is very difficult to fix a national pattern for this problem. Every State has different troubles. It will be one thing in one area and another in another, and a cure that might apply here would be wholly ineffective in another area. In my State we feel if we can get the high-school students properly organized and sufficiently interested by means of some psychological appeal that they feel they are taking a part in the war, and if we can get the cooperation of the school authorities—and there is no doubt it may cause some slight dislocation in the conduct of the classes—that we can very largely solve a part of the harvesting problem through that channel.

LAW PASSED BY NEW YORK LEGISLATURE PERMITTING 30-DAY LEAVE FOR HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS TO WORK ON FARMS

Dr. SIMONS. You probably know our State legislature has passed an act which permits a 30-day leave for any high-school student to work on the farm, without taking away any of the State's aid to that school.

Senator RUSSELL. I didn't know it, but I think it is a splendid idea.

Dr. SIMONS. That operated last year, and again will be in effect this year.

Mr. O'NEAL. I might say, Senator, I think a great many States have done the same thing.

Senator RUSSELL. That is certainly very interesting, Doctor. We are glad to have had you.

STATEMENT OF P. O. DAVIS, DIRECTOR, AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE, AUBURN, ALA.

FARM LABOR PROBLEM MUST BE HANDLED BY STATES AND COUNTIES

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Davis, of Alabama.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I concur with what Dr. Simons has said about this being a State job; and go a little further and say that it is also a county job. For example, in my State we have a different job in Baldwin County from any other county in the State. That is a trucking county. They grow a lot of Irish potatoes. So they have a different labor problem. But certainly the State is the biggest unit for which we can have a complete pattern.

I want to state a few basic facts on this farm labor job. The first is that farming is working. It takes a lot of steady work to operate farms. Especially is this true of many products of which we are asked to produce more meat, milk, eggs, and so forth. Cows, for example, have to be milked and fed twice a day, and the barns cleaned; and all those things 7 days a week. So we need lots of labor; especially do we need more labor now, because more farm production is needed.

LOSS OF FARM LABOR TO INDUSTRY AND TO ARMED FORCES

Farmers, as we all know, have lost a great deal of their best labor, that is, of the right age to do the best job on farms. They have lost them to the armed forces and to war industries. My State has lost more to war industries than to armed forces.

Senator RUSSELL. I think that is true all over the country.

Mr. DAVIS. That is right, Senator.

Senator HAYDEN. I think the ratio of 70 percent to industry and 30 percent to the Army is about right.

SOURCES FOR RECRUITMENT OF FARM LABOR

Mr. DAVIS. That is right. And all of that being true, the fact that we have fewer workers and need to do a bigger job, means we must recruit and train and place those who may be available to do the job. That means nonfarm youths in the high schools, just as Senator Russell said, and it means that more farm work must be done by women and youth.

Incidentally, over in Great Britain they have a Women's Volunteer Army on the farms, and they have done remarkably well. Our training process will have to go beyond the person to do the work. Nonfarm boys and girls in the towns and cities are not trained to do farm work. They must be trained. Along with that we must train the farmers as to how to take those boys and girls and make best use of them on their farms.

Most farmers in Alabama are a little reluctant to take city boys, as they call them. That was true over in Great Britain, where they were reluctant to take city boys and girls and women. But they have found by experience—since that was the best they could get—that

those young people and women have done remarkably good work. Farmers got themselves into an attitude using them in the best possible way. So they are getting along nicely over there; and we can do the same.

ATTITUDE OF STATE DIRECTORS OF EXTENSION SERVICE

I have contacted a number of State directors of extension on this. I haven't tried to get more than a good sample of them. They all appreciate fully the importance and the magnitude of this labor job. They are also very anxious to get explicit instructions from the Congress as to how to proceed, as to what Congress wants them to do. I know that this is my own feeling. I am sure, from the expressions that I have had from other directors, that they have the same feeling as to explicit instructions from Congress.

Senator HAYDEN. I think you are perfectly sound in the statement that if Congress is going to ask them to do this job, it ought to tell them as nearly as possible how to do it. Actually, however, I get a certain amount of reaction from certain people in the Extension Service who indicate a willingness, from patriotic motives, to render this service, but they are really not seeking the job.

Mr. DAVIS. I was going to add that, Senator, that we are not out seeking it. We realize it has headaches in it. But, Senator, our armed forces are fighting under the sea, in the air, in the desert, in the mud, in the jungles. They didn't seek this. It is necessary for our country at war. We have the same feeling about this labor job.

Senator HAYDEN. The fact that an organization has rendered a particular service well for a great many years, and though it isn't looking for a job, nevertheless is willing to take it if it is imposed upon them, is a good indication they probably could do the job well.

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct. Of course, there is another thing we would do, as has been brought out here already. We work very closely with farm people at the county level, the community level, and the State level; and when you do that on anything, you are almost sure to come out all right.

We have plenty to do—lots of work to do otherwise. But labor, or lack of labor, seems to be the bottleneck in increasing production which must be done if we eat enough. Therefore, our feeling is that we ought to offer ourselves and be most willing and anxious to do the very best possible job on farm labor.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM STATE DIRECTORS OF EXTENSION SERVICE

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you would be interested in them, I can submit to the committee telegrams from several State directors of extension. They are all I have, or received.

Senator RUSSELL. You may read them, if you wish, or you may turn them over to the reporter and have them printed in the record.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. If there are no questions, Mr. Chairman, that is all.

Senator RUSSELL. We are very glad to have heard you, Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Senator.

(The statements of State extension directors follow:)

BROOKINGS, S. DAK., *March 22, 1943.*

P. O. DAVIS,
Raleigh Hotel.

The provision of House Joint Resolution 96 can be satisfactorily carried out by the South Dakota Extension Service.

JOHN V. HELPER, *Director of Extension.*

ST. PAUL, MINN., *March 22, 1943.*

P. O. DAVIS,
Raleigh Hotel.

My original ideas regard bill were that Extension should have more money to handle assignment given us by secretary. Was not interested in labor movement within or without the county. Since the executive committee took action agreeing to this latter assignment I think we should stand squarely behind them and that is my present position.

PAUL E. MILLER.

LANSING, MICH., *March 22, 1943.*

P. O. DAVIS,
Raleigh Hotel.

Michigan endorses labor bill 96. Need action soon.

R. J. BALDWIN,
Michigan Extension Director.

MADISON, WIS., *March 22, 1943.*

P. O. DAVIS,
Raleigh Hotel:

Wisconsin Extension Service prepared assume duties assigned by Resolution 96. Prompt passage essential.

W. W. CLARK.

COLUMBIA, MO., *March 22, 1943.*

P. O. DAVIS,
Raleigh Hotel:

Missouri Extension ready move forward immediately on farm labor program upon final passage House Joint Resolution 96.

J. W. BURCH, *Director.*

GAINESVILLE, FLA., *March 22, 1943.*

P. O. DAVIS,
Director, Care Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

Florida Extension Service endorses Resolution 96. However, since alien and out-of-State labor likely to be extensively needed for seasonal crops Florida hopes precautions taken to provide full authority and avoid embarrassment that impossible situations may bring about.

A. P. SPENCER.

COLLEGE STATION, TEX., *March 22, 1943.*

P. O. DAVIS,
Director, Alabama Extension Service,
Care of the Raleigh Hotel:

Re tel. 21. We are not asking for labor job but if given assignment will put forth our best efforts. Think the approach outlined in Resolution 96 is sound.

H. H. WILLIAMSON.

LEXINGTON, KY., *March 21, 1943.*

P. O. DAVIS,
Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C.

We accept as work of extension in farm labor program whatever may be the judgment and will of the Congress. Very late to do effective job.

THOMAS COOPER.

RALEIGH, N. C., *March 22, 1943.*

Director P. O. DAVIS,
Care Raleigh Hotel.

The North Carolina extension service will gladly undertake any farm labor program Congress may see fit to assign us.

I. O. SCHAUB.

STATE COLLEGE, MISS., *March 21, 1943.*

P. O. DAVIS,
Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C.

Mississippi extension service, although busy, is ready to accept mandate of Congress in House Joint Resolution 96. Cannot express too strongly necessity of speed if farmers are to get assistance in locating labor. Crops being planted in south Mississippi. Many acres will be idle unless labor is located immediately.

L. I. JONES.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *March 22, 1943.*

P. O. DAVIS,
Raleigh Hotel.

Arkansas agricultural extension service urges passage of House Joint Resolution 96 in the Senate as passed in the House and without amendment. In the interest of production for war effort we are anxious to accept responsibility for entire farm-labor program in order that confusion of farmers may be eliminated.

AUBREY D. GATES.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *March 22, 1943.*

P. O. DAVIS,
Hotel Raleigh:

House Joint Resolution 96 has the essential feature of placing full responsibility for farm labor on one Federal agency. Agricultural Extension does not seek this responsibility but in view of the emergency will carry the burden if it is placed upon us.

B. H. CROCHERON.

MANHATTAN, KANS., *March 22, 1943.*

P. O. DAVIS,
Raleigh Hotel:

Farm labor bill 96 desirable to enable Extension to handle agricultural labor. Extension qualified because of its rural organization to handle farm-labor problem if finances are provided.

DIRECTOR H. UMBERGER.

CHAMPAIGN, ILL., *March 22, 1943.*

P. O. DAVIS,
Raleigh Hotel:

Retel from Burch. Immediate action on farm-labor program necessary. Believe House Joint Resolution 96 best procedure yet proposed, to meet wartime

emergency. Illinois extension service willing to accept responsibility outlined in 96 or to cooperate in any other manner Congress may direct.

H. P. RUSK.

Director P. O. DAVIS, WASHINGTON, D. C.
Washington, D. C.:

Heartily endorse House Resolution 96. Believe it is a sensible and economical approach to the serious problem that is presented to all of us.

T. B. SYMONS,
Dean and Director, University of Maryland.

P. O. DAVIS, AMES, IOWA, *March 23, 1943.*
Washington, D. C.:

We endorse position of Land Grant Executive Committee in regard to farm-labor problem.

R. K. BLISS.

Director P. O. DAVIS, UNIVERSITY, LA., *March 23, 1943.*
Washington, D. C.:

Extension Service will accept responsibility for farm-labor program.

H. C. SANDERS, *Director.*

P. O. DAVIS, LINCOLN, NEBR., *March 23, 1943.*
Washington, D. C.:

Our State extension service will make every effort to handle farm labor as outlined in 96. However, prefer transportation and camps be handled by other agencies.

W. H. BROKAW.

LAFAYETTE, IND., *March 23, 1943.*

P. O. DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.

Will endorse Farm Labor Bill as passed by House.

H. J. REED.

STATEMENT OF C. E. BREHM, DIRECTOR, AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE, TENN.

FARM LABOR PROGRAM MUST BE FLEXIBLE

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. C. E. Brehm, of Tennessee.

Senator RUSSELL. All right, Mr. Brehm.

Mr. BREHM. Senator Russell and members of the committee, I am the director of agricultural extension in Tennessee. I want to supplement just what the other two witnesses have said; particularly that any program to ameliorate the labor situation must be flexible enough to be adaptable to the States, because labor conditions are different in each of the States; and they are vastly different in different areas of the same State.

SURVEYS OF PROBLEM MADE IN TENNESSEE

Confirming just what you have said, Senator Russell, for the past year in our own State I have given considerable thought and study to this whole labor situation. We have made some very detailed surveys; and I am persuaded that if this labor situation is met or

ameliorated—and I don't say we will solve it, but we are going to have to pitch in and do the best we can—it is going to be done in the neighborhoods.

TWO PHASES OF FARM LABOR PROBLEM

There are two phases to this labor problem. One is with respect to the skilled labor, which has knowledge of the farm and the community and the land and so on, and which is necessary to operate that farm—the type of labor which knows how to handle the mules and plow, and which is familiar with that farm.

And we know, Senator, a farmer can plow and prepare to seed far more land than he can harvest.

Senator RUSSELL. There is no question about it

SECOND PHASE OF PROBLEM IS HARVESTING

Mr. BREHM. That brings in the second phase. At this particular time in our own State I have never seen, in the 25 years I have been in this work, as much land plowed, which reflects they are going to plant it in something. But there is apprehension and fear that when harvesttime comes getting the labor to harvest it will be most difficult.

QUESTION AS TO HOW MUCH MORE LAND HAS BEEN PLOWED THIS YEAR IN TENNESSEE

Senator O'MAHONEY. Would you venture a guess as to how much more land has been plowed in Tennessee this year?

Mr. BREHM. Senator, I cannot say, except this, that I have been traveling in that State in a car for the last 20 years, from one end of it to the other, and I have seen fields plowed now that haven't been plowed in 20 years. I know those fields.

INCREASED PLOWING NOT CONFINED TO TENNESSEE

Senator RUSSELL. To my utter amazement there was a witness here yesterday from the Department of Agriculture who testified that condition wasn't confined to Tennessee, but they had figures from other States indicating they were preparing land to a greater extend than ever before, and they are preparing to plant more.

DANGER OF NONPLANTING OF CRITICAL CROPS

Mr. BREHM. They are; but here is the danger. They are going to plant it in something; and the thing we are apprehensive about is that they will shift to those crops which require less hand labor. Yet our critical crops for the war effort are those which require hand labor—tomatoes, fruits, beans, and vegetables, for canning purposes. It is those crops from which our greatest proportion of exports are going this year.

MEETING SHORTAGE OF FARM LABOR LOCALLY

I don't want to take a lot of time of this committee, but I want to say that in meeting this labor situation, to a large degree it will have to be done in the locality and in the neighborhood, by farmers exchanging labor with each other to a greater degree than they ever have, by

exchanging the use of power equipment, particularly tractors and so on, in the neighborhood, and by having that power equipment going 6 days a week; and with lights on and working at night. I have seen, this past year, plows or tractors with lights on them, plowing all night to a degree I have never seen before. With a tractor and equipment to go with it, you can turn a tremendous amount of land if you operate that equipment night and day, which is being done.

USE OF FARMERS FROM SMALL SUBSISTENCE FARMS

Then, in meeting the situation, it will have to be done through the placement and employment of farmers from these small subsistence farms who have not been busy all the time, in hiring out a few days to the larger farmers an dthe larger surplus-producing farms. A certain amount of that is being done.

Taking families on these low-producing farms, the subsistence farms—and we have a lot of them in our country—and putting them on surplus-producing farms or with the operators of surplus-producing farms, where you get the maximum effect of their work in the production of the crops is needed. That is our skilled labor phase of this program.

USE OF BOYS AND GIRLS IN FARM WORK

Then we come to seasonal labor in the peak periods. Just as you have said, we must meet that to a large degree with boys and girls. In our State we have 80,000 boys and girls enrolled in 4–H Clubs. That is a pretty sizable army in itself. And I was talking the other day, just along the line of your remarks, discussing this matter with Governor Cooper. He is very much concerned about it. Although we haven't made any definite plans, he said he expected, in the near future, and he himself suggested it, giving these boys and girls some kind of insignia by the State which would signify the fact that they are serving in some kind of a land-use army to help out in the emergency. We will have those set up probably in every county.

EFFORTS IN TENNESSEE TO MEET FARM-LABOR PROBLEM

I want to say this, confirming what Dr. Simons has said. We have been cognizant of this problem since February a year ago. We have had a State labor committee set up. We have had in each county a county farm labor committee. Those committees have already been doing in a limited way some of the things we have been discussing here. If this bill is enacted it will make it possible to carry on those activities in a much more effective and larger way.

DEPENDENCE OF TENNESSEE'S PROGRAM ON COUNTY AGENT

As has been brought out in this hearing, this revolves about the county agent. You can talk about other agencies, and so on; but the county agent is the fellow the farmer knows. Other agencies, if they want to get any work done, have to go through him to make the contract.

EFFECT OF DRAFT DEFERMENT ON FARM WORKERS

These war industrial plants—just to give you an illustration—have men employed in them who want to get back on farms, on account of the fact that they will be in a critical occupation and be deferred. There are quite a number of these.

EFFECT OF RATIONING ON FORMER FARM WORKERS

Senator HAYDEN. There is another factor, too, in addition to declaring agricultural work critical and therefore exempt from the draft. When you impose rationing on the population in general, people who have lived on farms and enjoyed farm food think about going back to the farm, as against living on limited rations in a town, where their money is no good beyond the ration tickets.

COOPERATION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE BOARDS

Mr. BREHM. That is right. Just the other day one of the county agents showed me a form letter that has already been prepared by the local selective-service board. These men come to the local board for placement on farms. They refer them to the county agent, and they have their deferral letter already worked out. They are coming to that board now in such numbers that it is a real job to place those people. If the county agent continues to perform that service, Senator, he must have more assistance. That is what it amounts to.

Senator HAYDEN. That is right.

NEED FOR FARM LABOR CENTERS IN COUNTIES

Mr. BREHM. Here is what this thing needs in the county, as I see it. It needs in the county some individual, under the supervision of the county agent and in cooperation with these county farm labor committees, who will get together those who want jobs on farms; and the fellow who needs help; and see that the fellow who wants plowing done gets the tractor of his neighbor when it isn't in use.

Do you get what I am driving at?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BREHM. And clear all these labor activities through one office. In other words, a place where those who want employment on farms can file an application, where those who need help on their farms can file an order. If that is organized properly down in the county, a tremendous amount can be done to ameliorate this condition.

USE OF COUNTY WAR BOARDS

Senator O'MAHONEY. What are the county war boards doing now?

Mr. BREHM. Well, they are busy. They are helping increase production.

(A discussion followed off the record.)

QUESTION OF DUPLICATION IF A LABOR AGENCY UNDER EXTENSION WERE SET UP

Senator O'MAHONEY. Now, may I ask the witness, on the record, if a labor agency were set up under the terms of this bill, under

the direction of the Extension Service, would that duplicate any existing labor service?

Mr. BREHM. No, sir. Any bill appropriating money should be flexible enough to fit into what has already been started in the States to handle this labor situation. This bill doesn't in any way conflict with what we already have. It should supplement it.

NUMBER OF AGENCIES TRYING TO HANDLE FARM LABOR IN TENNESSEE

Senator O'MAHONEY. How many agencies now are trying to handle farm labor in Tennessee?

Mr. BREHM. Well, I will tell you what came out in the papers within the last week or 10 days. One announcement came out in the paper—and I wish I had brought those clippings—said "See the Farm Security Administration." Another one said to see the U. S. Employment Service, and another to see the War Board.

Extension has purposely kept quiet and made no announcement so that they wouldn't add to the confusion, at least until this matter is clarified by the Congress.

COOPERATION OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Our cooperative relationships with the Federal Employment Service are very good. In west Tennessee we are going to have quite a large berry acreage, and berries to be picked, and they will have to be picked by early May. Already in there and in cooperation with the U. S. Employment Service, we have made the surveys to determine the amount of labor that is going to be needed. We have assured those farmers over there that we are going to get that labor somewhere; and we will. I think it can be recruited from the type of labor you were talking about, Senator Russell. from the boys and girls—the nonfarm people. We ought to have the same program under way in another berry area in the State. Estimates I have indicate that it will take 2,000 pickers in there. I am convinced that we can get them.

PLANS BEING MADE TO HARVEST STRING BEAN CROP IN TENNESSEE

I have been up in another county, in the upper, eastern corner of the State, Johnson, where they will have 6,000 acres of string beans. That is a lot of beans, and they will begin to harvest them the last of August, during September, and up until about the 10th of October, when frost hits up there. We are making our plans now to be prepared to have the labor when the time comes.

FUNDS NEEDED TO ORGANIZE PROGRAM IN COUNTIES

So that, as I have said, after all, Senator, our job is to help the farmers and particularly now to get these crops produced and harvested. Whether we have the facilities or whether we don't, we still have that responsibility. We must help do something about it; do the job right and effectively. We need some money from some source to organize the thing correctly in the counties.

ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS FACED BY COUNTY AGENTS

I want to make this further observation about what a county agent is up against. I saw one of our agents the other day, and he had a pocketful of letters from Army officers and from the fathers of boys in the Army about his writing letters to somebody to get them out of the Army. There has been considerable publicity about a boy who is needed on the farm and at home. If he can present the proper evidence he is needed on that farm, he can be discharged from the Army. As soon as something of that kind comes out in the papers, that is one thing farmers read. Then the farmer writes his boy, for the boy to talk to his commanding officer about getting out of the Army. The commanding officer, presumably, tells the boy to write his father to get the county agent to write him a letter. That thing started a regular deluge; he just had a pocketful of those letters. There hasn't been set up, so far as I know, any definite procedure.

I could go on and enumerate just one thing after another about this whole farm situation and what the county agents are trying to do to meet it. But it has gotten to the point now where it seems to me these various activities are going to have to be coordinated into some kind of pattern in the counties.

I have talked longer than I expected to, Senator Russell, and I certainly appreciate your courtesy.

Senator RUSSELL. We thank you.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED BY AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. O'NEAL. We may have some clarifying amendments to offer. We would like to present these to you later.

(Mr. O'Neal subsequently presented the following amendments):

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96

1. On page 2, line 4, after the fourth word, "apportioned" add "and paid."
2. On page 2, line 22, after the letters, "tioned", add "and paid."
3. On page 2, line 19, strike out the word "less", and insert the word "more."
4. On page 4, lines 5, 6, and 7, strike out the following: "subject to general rules and regulations to be issued by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the United States Employment Services:" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That the necessary funds to carry out such cooperative agreements may be allocated and paid by the Federal Office of Extension to the cooperating agency."
5. On page 4, line 15, strike out the words "Commissioner of Agriculture", and substitute therefor, "Director of Extension."

Senator RUSSELL. We will resume at 2:30.

(Wherenpon at 1:15 p. m., the subcommittee was in recess until 2:30 the same afternoon, Tuesday, March 23, 1943.)

AFTER RECESS

(The subcommittee reconvened at 2:30 p. m., pursuant to recess.)

STATEMENT OF RT. REV. JOHN O'GRADY, REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE

Senator RUSSELL. Father O'Grady, you have expressed a desire to be heard with regard to House Joint Resolution 96. We would be happy to have you make any statement you see fit.

Father O'GRADY. My name is the Right Reverend John O'Grady. I represent the National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

OBSERVATIONS ON MIGRATORY LABOR

Now, I want to discuss certain features of the House Joint Resolution No. 96, and I shall discuss it on the basis of my own observations—my contacts with migratory labor during the past several years and especially during the past year.

I have been very much interested in the movement of workers, particularly the Mexican workers from Texas to Colorado and to Michigan, and also their movement in the State of Texas.

I followed them quite closely. I have been particularly interested in agricultural labor in the beet-sugar industry. I have been out in the fields with the workers, and I think I know something about how they are used. I have also had considerable contact with migratory agricultural labor in the Imperial Valley, San Joaquin, and Sacramento Valleys, in California; some contacts also with agricultural labor in Arkansas.

INTEREST IN WELFARE OF MEXICAN WORKER

For many years I have been interested in the welfare of the Mexican worker on our border. I have studied this problem not only from the moral angle but also, as I have been in Mexico a good deal, I have studied the attitude of the Mexicans themselves toward agricultural labor. I have gathered from contacting the Mexicans that it is a very important problem in our dealings with that country.

TREATMENT OF WORKERS AT THE BORDER

In dealing with Mexico, one gets the impression that the people at the top are very favorable to us but below there is a good deal of irritation, and it is due largely to the treatment their people receive on the border. That is what leading Mexicans tell me.

SITUATION IN LOS ANGELES

We have been through a terrific struggle in Los Angeles during the past year in dealing with Mexican workers. We have had a hard time securing any training for them.

I saw a good deal of that situation last year when the farmers up the valley were clamoring for workers. I knew from my contacts with the Mexicans and the Mexican consul general there were thousands of workers available in Los Angeles, but there was no agency to move those workers.

SUGAR COMPANIES USE OWN AGENTS TO RECRUIT WORKERS

Now, these workers in the past were moved around widely; the sugar interests had their own agents who yearly would go to Texas or Louisiana, if they were recruiting workers for California.

NUMBER OF WORKERS NEEDED NEVER CORRECTLY ESTIMATED

I saw them in the Lower Rio Grande Valley last spring and I intend to see them again this year. They were in a very peculiar position. They never knew exactly how many were needed. It was impossible to find out how many had been recruited. The estimates varied anywhere between 20,000 and 40,000 last year. They try to get as many as they can. The Michigan Sugar Co. officials told me they got 7,500 from Texas last year. They made a second effort and got very few.

NO SUPERVISION OF LABOR SUPPLY

Of course one has to know something about how the Employment Service operates in this connection. Texas was becoming rather jittery about its own labor supply at that time. At any rate, they could not get them; the relationship between the grower and the factory is not sufficiently close. There was nobody to supervise the labor supply and see to it that it was used properly.

OVERSUPPLY OF LABOR IN FORMER YEARS

Now, you may say that was nobody's business. Of course, when we had a large supply of labor, as in the past, it did not make much difference whether we lifted the beets this week or next week, because there was always an oversupply of labor.

PART PLAYED BY LABOR CONTRACTORS

I watched the labor contractors and they watched me, too. The contractors wanted to know what I was saying. The contractors brought labor from Florida up to western New York.

I am going to follow that group from Florida this year and see what happens. I know the grape crop would not have been harvested last year but for those Negroes. I know how they operated; for one thing, they kept the boys together. The Government does not do that; the boys are let run off to town. Some of the colored boys said to me: "Reverend, do you know of any jobs in town a fellow could get?" Sometimes the farmers think they are doing a clever thing to get them to check out of the camp. The moment they become separated, one from the other, the group breaks up entirely.

That is entirely beyond the contractors. I do not know of any other group that has had as large an amount of experience in employing migratory agricultural labor as the contractors.

Senator HAYDEN. I am just a little puzzled, Father.

Father O'GRADY. Yes?

LABOR CONTRACTORS ARE PRIVATE CONCERNS

Senator HAYDEN. Where there were certain men realizing there was a labor shortage in New York and without any Government connection of any kind, they went into the South and recruited Negro labor and brought them to New York?

Father O'GRADY. No; what they did, Senator, was this: They established contact, I think the fruit companies helped them in establishing contact with several contractors, labor contractors.

One man, about 2 years ago, a large grower in western New York, went south and established contact with a contractor. That one contractor brought up a supply of labor to be used on this grower's farm, but not merely on this one farm; the contractor made plans for the use of the labor. No Government agency had anything to do with this.

Senator HAYDEN. That is what I wanted to know.

QUESTION OF GOVERNMENT USING CONTRACTORS SYSTEM

Father O'GRADY. I have been telling the Government agencies they ought to take some lessons from the contractors. I saw this contractor; he was there last year a second time. Since that first experience worked pretty well, other farmers in western New York went down to Florida and established contact with the contractors.

QUESTION AS TO WHETHER FARM LABOR CAN BE BETTER OBTAINED BY PRIVATE CONTRACTORS OR BY GOVERNMENT

Senator MCKELLAR. Father, may I interrupt you for a moment?

Father O'GRADY. Yes, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. From your experience and your observations, too, which have evidently been considerable, in your judgment, can this labor be handled better by the contractors, or can this labor proposition be handled better by private contractors than by the Government?

Father O'GRADY. Senator, you know my observations have been sufficiently broad to enable me to speak. My general observation in regard to the whole question of the employing of agricultural labor in the United States, and I have been trying to keep close to the situation, is that we have had no Government agency other than the Farm Security Administration, which has come close to the problem.

ASSISTANCE OF FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

I got my first information from my contacts with camps in California. I have been around those camps a good deal in the past 2 years. They did help to get workers. They were the only group in there. The contractors were in there, too. They are always in with the Spanish workers. We do not necessarily have to call them contractors—but I have suggested to the Government agencies that they ought to use the contract service and the experience of the contractors.

QUESTION AS TO WHETHER CONTRACTOR COULD COVER ENTIRE FIELD

Whether the contractor could cover the whole field, I have some doubts. I think it is an awfully difficult problem to handle, and frankly, I have found very few people who seem to have an understanding of the actual problem of the employment of migratory agricultural labor. I have not seen anybody that has been as efficient at it as the contractor.

EFFECT OF GASOLINE RATIONING

Senator McKellar. May I ask another question right there? And then I shall not interrupt you further.

Father O'Grady. Yes, sir.

Senator McKellar. What effect does the limited use of gasoline have? I understand that the migratory workers have, in the past, largely gone from place to place in cars.

Father O'Grady. That is right.

Senator McKellar. Of the cheaper variety.

Father O'Grady. That is correct.

Senator McKellar. And that very large numbers of them are transported, or transported themselves, over the country in that way.

Father O'Grady. That is right.

Senator McKellar. Now, there has been rationing of gasoline practically all over the country, I believe, and I wonder what effect that will have on the migratory labor situation.

Father O'Grady. I do not like to speculate about this. I have made some soundings and I expect to make more next month. I want to go to Texas and see what the Mexicans plan to do this summer.

WORKERS LEFT COLORADO AND MICHIGAN

Last summer there were a number of Mexicans left Colorado and Michigan. At least, I was told they had left. When I visited Michigan in October, I found a number of them had returned. Gasoline had not been rationed then, Senator, in that area, but there was quite a debate on as to whether they would get gasoline, and a considerable number of families left early, before the topping.

HELP GIVEN TO WORKERS BY PRIVATE CONCERNS

The representatives of the sugar companies, the Michigan Sugar Co., in particular, I know, because I talked to their agents both in Texas and at Saginaw, and here in Washington, helped them last year make contacts with local rationing boards. There was some effort made last year also to supply transportation for them. Undoubtedly this is going to have a very serious influence. I do not know what you can do about it.

ELIMINATION OF PROVISO REQUIRING CONSENT OF COUNTY AGENT OR STATE AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONER FOR MOVEMENT OF LABOR

When you combine it with this amendment, which I think virtually freezes labor on a county basis, I think it will be much more difficult for the migratory workers. I am speaking about the two States that I know best. Of course, I know the California situation also quite well. It would be difficult for them to get out of the lower Rio Grande Valley. I think I know sufficient about Texas to say that it is going to be difficult. I shall be interested in seeing what difficulties it presents to the agents of the sugar companies at this time. There is no use talking about employing sufficient labor along the Platte River and eastern Michigan to tend, weed, and top the sugar beets. I think that raises a real question this time.

Senator HAYDEN. I understand, Father, as far as your recommendation is concerned, that this amendment which was adopted on the floor of the House, which provides no labor shall be taken out of a county except on the approval of the county agent, or out of the State except with the approval of the State agricultural authorities, is impracticable and ought to come out?

Father O'GRADY. I think it ought to come out. I think it is impracticable because this is a national problem. I think the people are still thinking of it as a local problem. That has been the trouble, as I see it.

Now, this is a national problem, and I think a very serious situation.

I have been in contact indirectly through some friends of mine with this new group of Mexicans, and I am very much concerned about the situation in California right now.

I do not believe last year we had any shortage. I did not see any shortage any place I visited. There may have been shortages in other places. I have not been over the whole country. I am talking about the situations that I have seen; I know in some places they talked about shortages.

FAILURE OF CONCERNS TO ESTIMATE NUMBER OF WORKERS CORRECTLY

For instance, the Michigan Sugar Co. said they needed 500 additional Kentuckians. I said to the President, "How do you know?"

He said, "That is what they tell me."

They never figured it up. I find that when they say they need 10,000 you usually can get a figure like that down to about 800 or 1,000. When you begin to talk about actual workers, the number that they actually need, you can cut it down considerably. That is the reason why this is so difficult.

QUESTION AS TO ADVISABILITY OF USE OF COUNTY AGENT

Senator HAYDEN. Do you think that there can be any better authority than the county agricultural agent in each county to make an actual check of the number of workers needed in the county? Of all the officials that you know, do you know of any official closer to the farmer?

Father O'GRADY. I am sorry to have to say this, that the farmers have not been as objective about it as they should be. This is particularly true of the large growers. They do not realize, apparently, that we are in a new period. It is very hard to talk realities to them, I find.

What I am afraid of, frankly, Senator, is that the county agent will be subject to very high pressure, just as the Employment Service has been.

For instance, take your own State, 25,000 workers were said to be needed. Somehow or other, it was down to 5,000 by the time it got to Washington.

WORKERS NOT CERTIFIED IN ARIZONA UNTIL ESTIMATE WAS CHECKED

Senator HAYDEN. I know in my own State what actually happened was that the Employment Service never did certify the need of labor

until they had made a complete check, and when they did make certification, the labor was needed. We never get a certification for an excess number of workers out of the United States Employment Service.

I did hear growers estimate, and other people talk in generalities there, but when it came to putting it down on paper that so many workers were actually needed in a county, the United States Employment Service never did certify more than they actually needed.

Father O'GRADY. I would not know about Arizona, but I can give you some figures in other places about overcertifying.

FAILURE OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE TO KEEP IN TOUCH WITH SITUATION

I think frankly the same is true of industrial labor in some of these towns. The Employment Service has never gotten close to the farmers or close to the supply of agricultural labor.

I could cite case after case. A group of workers were brought from Kentucky to Michigan; the Michigan Sugar Co. did not know how many they needed and the United States Employment Service had certified there were 500 needed; when the workers got there they were not really needed. If the existing supply of workers had been used in a rational way, it would have been better.

CERTIFICATION OF MEXICAN LABORERS

Senator HAYDEN. With respect to certification of Mexicans, there has been certified up to date out of Salt River Valley in Arizona to Mexico City, 1,000 workers. Seven hundred are guaranteed year-round employment, either in winter vegetables, summer crops and cotton in the fall, and 300 of them year-round employment in keeping the irrigation ditches clean of silt and weeds. The Water Users Association has guaranteed to employ 300 Mexicans the year-round to clean their ditches. The other growers, comprising the growing of citrus, vegetables, cantaloupes, and cotton have gone into one group and determined their needs, and so we know we can take care of them.

The Employment Service checked them, and it has been certified through the State Department. They are now trying to recruit them in Mexico City. That is a carefully done job, and there cannot be any question but that the 1,000 men can be employed and kept employed. I do not know how it is, Father, in other places. I do know in the old times the manufacturer did delight in having a great pool of labor around the factory, so if one man went off, another could be taken on. I do not doubt the farmers likewise would like a great pool of labor. I thoroughly agree with the Father.

QUESTION AS TO USE OF COUNTY AGENTS

Senator BROOKS. Who is better than the county agents for this purpose?

Father O'GRADY. For the employment of local labor, I think the county agent could do pretty well. But I think we are facing a transitional situation, in which it is very difficult to get the farmers

to cooperate. They take an easy-going attitude. If I were doing it, for instance, if I wanted to find out how many workers were needed in Michigan this summer, the first thing I would do would be to go to the sugar companies and the growers. I would sit down and talk about the use of existing sources of labor.

USE OF SCHOOL CHILDREN IN FARM WORK

And then I would like to talk about the use of school children. That situation has not been worked out very systematically. I think a great many are interested, but it has to be done very carefully.

Senator McCarran. How would you do it, Father?

Father O'Grady. Take 15-year-old or 16-year-old boys, for instance. I think they might be very useful in the beet fields. But the hours of work would have to be regulated. Who would do that I do not know. I have seen it done by contractors. I saw boys in western New York picking fruit last summer. They could work in the fruit industry very well, I think. It has been done in the South for a long time. I picked cotton in North Carolina with some school children. They closed the school at certain times and kept them open in June and July. I do not think people on week ends could get very far on the farm. You have to spend some days on the farm before you are of any use.

There is lots of work on farms on which children could be used, and used very effectively, but under the most careful supervision.

USE OF 15- AND 16-YEAR-OLD BOYS LIMITED

Senator Nye. Father, up in the North Dakota region, these 14-, 15-, 16-, and 17-year-olds just cannot be used unless they are unusually large-sized boys. They just cannot be used in the type of harvesting operations in that area.

Father O'Grady. Shocking and pitching.

Senator Nye. Yes; that is a man's work.

Father O'Grady. I have been through that and know what it means.

Senator Nye. They could dig potatoes.

Father O'Grady. They could dig potatoes. I think you need some training even in topping beets. It has been one of the greatest problems among the Mexicans. I think they are not careful enough. I have seen the children get some very severe cuts. There is a very sharp knife used to top the beets. It is not, however, heavy work, the topping of beets. Weeding beets is not very heavy work, either.

RECOMMENDATION WITH RESPECT TO PENDING MEASURE

Senator Hayden. Father, what do you think we had better do with this bill?

Father O'Grady. My honest conviction is this: I think you ought to give some money to the Secretary of Agriculture and hold him responsible instead of writing out a bill like this. It seems to me this program will not work.

Senator Russell. I certainly agree with you.

EFFECT OF MEASURE IF ENACTED AS PASSED BY HOUSE

Father O'GRADY. I think you will freeze labor locally. I do not think the Employment Service is going to be of much use. I have criticized the Employment Service. When I judge an agency, I judge it not by what I hear in Washington, but by my observations in the field. I judge it on the basis of what it is actually doing.

QUESTION AS TO EFFICIENCY OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Senator HAYDEN. Do you join with Mr. McNutt in saying the reason why he has not an efficient Employment Service is that the rates of pay fixed by Congress for those who work there are so low that he has had a continual turn-over, more than 100 percent, so that he cannot keep trained, efficient people in the service?

Is there any merit in that?

Father O'GRADY. There is some merit in that, but the story is very much more complex than that.

The Employment Service has a peculiar mentality that is hard to describe. I have observed it in the administration of its local offices, and I have been in hundreds of them; and I have observed the work of personnel department in factories. I think the personnel departments of industries have done a remarkable job in many respects.

The Employment Service, originally a State organization, has remained a State organization. I think it has "State" in its mentality.

RECRUITMENT OF FARM LABOR

My idea would be to get a few skilled people to recruit—you need technical people to do it, but I do not think you need a research service to do it. If the sugar growers want to recruit their own labor, let them do it. You can keep in touch with them. You can see to it that they do not cut one another's throats, that they are not overlapping in recruiting, that they observe some rules which will have to be laid down for them. I think that is one thing we will have to keep in mind.

In one town in western New York I asked the Employment Service, "Do you have any contractors?"

They stated, "No, we have turned them all out."

I met a gentleman in the street, a buyer for United Foods, and I asked, "How are the crops cultivated?"

He said, "They have a lot of Negro labor."

I asked him, "How do they get them up here?"

He said, "Well, they have contractors."

Here, five minutes before I had been told they had taken them all out.

PROPOSAL TO CHARGE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE WITH RECRUITING OF FARM LABOR

I would give this money to Secretary Wickard and simply say, You are responsible for setting up a service to recruit agricultural

labor. I think you will have to give him adequate funds because otherwise he is not going to be able to do anything much. You cannot hold him responsible if you do not give him adequate funds, but I think instead of specifying, he should be left free to make the best use of the county agent, and of everybody else. Just do not tie him down to a particular agency or write any specifications into the bill.

That is what I would prefer to see done. I think this writing in of specific provisions is a mistake. I think it might be interpreted as a slap at the Government of Mexico.

IMPORTATION OF LABOR FROM MEXICO

We know very well the Mexicans have not been any too enthusiastic to send us laborers and maybe they have a reason. There is a long history back of this. There are some people on the border who say I ought to mind my own business; even some of my friends in Texas say that I ought to stay at home. I am not going to stay home. I am going to keep on working with the border situation. I do not see how we can negotiate an agreement with Mexico and do nothing about carrying it out. I know of some of the trouble we have had in the Arizona situation.

RESTRICTIONS AT BORDER ON MEXICANS

Senator HAYDEN. I think you will find this true, Father. In Arizona, southern California, and New Mexico, and Texas, you will find the Mexican normally came across the border from nearby States like Sonora, Chihuahua, Coahuila, and Nuevo León, worked a while and went back. They came and went as they were needed. There was no particular difficulty about it.

The way the situation stands now, that is entirely prohibited, as I understand it.

Father O'GRADY. That is right.

Senator HAYDEN. That no one may come in from the border.

Father O'GRADY. That is right.

Senator HAYDEN. That the importation of labor must come way down from the heart of Mexico.

Father O'GRADY. That is right.

REASON FOR IMPORTING WORKERS FROM THE INTERIOR OF MEXICO

Senator HAYDEN. One reason given for that was that if the Mexicans came from the interior of the country, they would learn something about American agricultural methods and take that knowledge back.

It is more difficult for the farmer to use someone who knows nothing about agricultural methods than it is a man who has been here before.

LABOR ON BORDER GOING INTO INDUSTRY

Is there any objection in your mind, if the Mexican Government could be persuaded to do so, to permit the recruitment of labor on the border?

Father O'GRADY. Those States are thinly populated. Monterrey is highly industrialized now, and I suppose they need a number in the city of Monterrey.

I have talked to a great number, Senator, in Mexico, and also Mexicans who are here, and to be frank, most of them were dissatisfied with their treatment in this country.

I have talked to folks by the roadside in Mexico. I have been in their homes in Mexican cities.

I think, on the whole, the border situation, as I see it, has a bad record, a very bad record.

I understand what your point is, Senator. It seems to me that I would be inclined to follow along and not bring too much pressure to bear on the Government of Mexico. They know their own people. I do not think we ought to go too far with them. If they have a point of view, I think we ought to reckon with it.

Senator HAYDEN. There is nothing else you can do, as a matter of fact.

Father O'GRADY. It has been done.

IMPORTATION OF MEXICAN WORKERS INTO YUMA AREA

Senator HAYDEN. The last importation of labor in Arizona, that I know anything about, was in the Yuma area. I speak enough Spanish to be able to talk to some of the laborers, and they indicated they were very well satisfied, and the farmers were particularly satisfied.

They said it was the finest labor group they ever had. They really came from farms in Mexico. It was an excellent selection made in Mexico. There was not a very large number, 400 or 500. I think it makes a lot of difference as to the man you bring in; does it not, Father?

Father O'GRADY. Yes; of course, most of the population of Mexico are rural people; after all, there are only a very few cities. I think most of the workers who came among the 7,000 imported were farmers. I heard, however, there were some city folks in the group.

Senator HAYDEN. They did not come to Arizona.

Father O'GRADY. Most of them were from the City of Mexico itself, I mean, the Federal District, and from the State of Mexico. I think they got some from the city of Pueblo. I think it is important to get farmer workers.

QUESTION OF RACIAL DIFFICULTY AT THE BORDER

I will have to admit I have had such unhappy experiences along the border, that my views are likely to be somewhat one-sided. When I go down along the border and hear Texans claim they own every gallon of water in the Rio Grande, I think we have got to be fairer than that. We ought to be contributing to a dry, arid country in a better way than that.

When I organized a U. S. O. center in Texas, they told me they would have to have two or three others. They said there would be one for Mexicans and one for Negroes. The South's problems are their own, and I have great respect for the mentality and leadership

of the South, and I am trying to keep out of their affairs, but in the Mexican situation that is another story. We are dealing with a great nation to the south of us. Some of the Mexicans they were talking about were New Mexicans. They wanted to establish a "Jim Crow" law for New Mexicans. I am not going to mention the city, but I have seen so much of this on the border, that I know a good deal about the background of the border situation, and I think the record is not good.

Senator HAYDEN. Is is not true that the record you speak of was mostly made during the period of the depression in this country when farm prices were down and there was only a demand for this labor seasonally?

Senator BROOKS. Did not the prohibition era have something to do with it, too?

INCREASE IN WAGES PAID WORKERS IMPORTED FROM MEXICO

Senator HAYDEN. It may have had something to do with it, too. We are in the war. Mexico is in the war, too. A critical situation has developed in the United States where we need all the help we can get. As far as wages are concerned, nobody is complaining about what they have to pay; they just want the men.

For example, the Mexican labor contract is 30 cents an hour, and the farmers in my State started paying 40 and 50 cents an hour and were glad to do it.

Senator MCCARRAN. How do they pay for cotton?

Senator HAYDEN. By the pound, but the rate per pound which was very low heretofore, has increased to 4 cents a pound for long staple cotton, so a man that was at all expert did not make only $4 a day, but he made $5, $6, or more, so the income received was satisfactory. That is our problem today, and I entirely agree with the Father so far as the Mexican labor is concerned, that we have to get the Mexican labor on terms the Mexican Government sets down. They are citizens of a neighboring republic, a sovereign nation.

EFFECT OF HOUSE PROVISIONS ON IMPORTING WORKERS FROM MEXICO

Senator RUSSELL. As I pointed out, this bill as now before this committee, affects the good faith of this Government in a contract that has already been entered into.

Father O'GRADY. There is nothing to negotiate, except to tell them to send the workers over here. We cannot talk about wages. We cannot talk about living conditions. We cannot talk about anything, except, sending them over here.

Senator RUSSELL. It does not even promise them a going wage.

Father O'GRADY. No.

Senator RUSSELL. I do not think they would get one under this law.

Father O'GRADY. It would be very difficult to get anything under this provision. I wonder how such a provision could have gotten into a bill, especially at this critical time when we are faced with the serious situation of being unable to produce even as much as we produced last year in agriculture, and everybody ought to be trying his

best, by every possible scheme, to increase the supply, to increase our agricultural output. I cannot see how such a provision could have been brought in. It would be a source of irritation, I am sure. We have recently had some problems dealing with Mexican labor that we did not have before. That is to be expected. We will have new problems, because, after all, Mexico has had a revolution. The Mexican of today is different from the Mexican of 15 years ago. He is an individual. He talks about his right; he talks about the division of the land; and he talks about a lot of other things he would not have talked about 15 years ago.

I understand sometimes they even strike. I have heard there have been as many as 200. This may be an exaggeration.

Senator RUSSELL. I do not think you would have those difficulties because you would not have any of them here. Unless you could give them some assurance about wages, there would not be any here to have trouble with.

Father O'GRADY. That is right, Senator. You would find it difficult to negotiate any agreement.

Take for instance this two-thirds and three-fourths time provision. In Michigan they never employed Mexicans for more than 8 weeks out of 24. We should be able to use them more than that.

We should not allow labor we have shipped a thousand miles, to stand idle a long time and use it but one-third or one-fourth of the time.

People have said to me, why does not the Employment Service come out here and give them employment. The Employment Service has never done that. You have to plan to get them and keep them together in groups and that has been quite a problem with the Mexicans.

In one place in the San Joaquin Valley, the growers applied for 1,800 and were told to cut it to 600. When they said, 600 would not do, they were told to ask for an additional 600 the day following and 600 a few days later. When they found they had to make a contract the number was cut to 800.

Senator RUSSELL. Do you have anything further that you want to say now, Father?

Father O'GRADY. No, sir; I have not. I think that finishes what I have to say.

Senator RUSSELL. We are very glad to have had you and your views on this subject.

STATEMENT OF H. L. MITCHELL, GENERAL SECRETARY, SOUTHERN TENANT FARMERS UNION, MEMPHIS, TENN.

MEMBERSHIP AND DUES OF SOUTHERN TENANT FARMERS UNION

Senator RUSSELL. All right; you may proceed.

Mr. MITCHELL. My name is H. L. Mitchell, general secretary, Southern Tenant Farmers Union, Memphis, Tenn.

Our organization is largely in the States of Arkansas, Missouri, Mississippi, and Alabama.

Senator McCARRAN. About how many members do you have?

Mr. MITCHELL. Approximately 20,000, but all of them are not paying dues.

Senator THOMAS. What are the dues?

Mr. MITCHELL. $3 a year.

Senator THOMAS. Payable how often?

Mr. MITCHELL. As often as we can collect it.

Senator MCCARRAN. How many have you paid up actually, now?

Mr. MITCHELL. About 15 or 20 percent.

Senator MCCARRAN. About 15 or 20 percent.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; probably three or four thousand are paid up now because conditions are somewhat better.

Senator MCCARRAN. What kind of staff or headquarters do you maintain?

Mr. MITCHELL. We have just an office in the city of Memphis. We have one stenographer and myself. Our other officers live and work in the field. I have a statement here I would like to read, if I may.

Senator RUSSELL. All right, you may proceed.

Mr. MITCHELL. Our organization is vitally interested in legislation being adopted by Congress to assist in supplying farm labor needed to plant, cultivate, and harvest the Nation's wartime crops.

WORK IN TRANSPORTING FARM LABOR TO AREAS WHERE NEEDED

During the past 4 months, the Southern Tenant Farmers Union has been instrumental in aiding the War Manpower Commission and the Farm Security Administration in sending over 2,500 experienced farm workers from the Midsouth to other areas where there were shortages of workers.

In November and December, 2,000 were sent out to help harvest long staple cotton in Arizona, New Mexico, and southwest Texas, and in January and February 500 more were sent to Florida to help harvest vegetatble crops.

We now have upward of 2,000 additional workers enlisted in our volunteer farm labor force prepared to go anywhere any time the Government states they are needed to help plant, cultivate, or harvest crops.

Throughout the Southern States there are thousands of other farm laborers who, if a means is provided for their transportation to areas where their labor is needed, will welcome an opportunity to do their part in helping win the war.

We know that thousands of experienced farm laborers in these States could be transported to other sections of the country without upsetting the present farm operations in the South.

Senator MCCARRAN. Do you mind an interruption?

Mr. MITCHELL. No, sir.

TYPE OF LABOR TRANSPORTED

Senator MCCARRAN. What is the type of that labor, colored people?

Mr. MITCHELL. No; the largest portion are white people who live in the poor or hill sections of the country, and people who drift into the Delta plantations sections to pick cotton in the fall.

POSITION ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96 AS PASSED BY HOUSE

However, it is our belief that if this bill as passed by the House of Representatives is adopted that there will be few, if any, of these workers recruited or transported out of the South.

We do not believe that the Agricultural Extension Service is capable of handling this problem which is national in scope. The Agricultural Extension Service operates on a county level. We know that there is not a county agent in the Midsouth who would admit that there is a surplus of farm labor in his county, no matter how many workers were available for employment elsewhere.

DETERMINATION OF WHERE THERE ARE SURPLUSES OF FARM LABOR

Senator McCarran. When you get the information there is a surplus, how do you get the information?

Mr. Mitchell. How do we get it?

Senator McCarran. Yes.

Mr. Mitchell. We have over 3,000 who have asked us to help them to get a place to work on farms, to be shipped out anywhere.

Senator Russell. You mean 3,000 in these States; they could not secure employment locally?

Mr. Mitchell. They had no employment at all. Their only opportunity for employment is a short period of 6 weeks from May 15 to July 1, chopping cotton and in the picking season from September to the 1st of November.

Senator Russell. They are people who have customarily done seasonal work?

Mr. Mitchell. Yes, sir.

Senator Russell. Have some of them had farms of their own?

Mr. Mitchell. Some of them have had farms of their own.

Senator Russell. I did not mean owners, but they have operated farms?

Mr. Mitchell. Some have been tenants and sharecroppers and due to the mechanization, and the cutting down the cotton acreage, they have only had small crops, so small that they could not make enough off of them to live.

Senator Russell. That has been one tragic features of the A. A. A. program. There was a boderline case of people making a fairly good living, and they took their reduction in acreage, which made them operate without any opportunity of making a living.

Mr. Mitchell. That is true. Some of these people who could formerly make a good living with 12 or 15 acres of cotton when it was cut down to 4 or 5, or 6 acres, there was not enough to provide a living.

Due to local pressure we do not believe that the County Supervisors of the Farm Security Administration could do a better job than the County Agents.

NATURE OF AMENDMENTS REQUESTED

We urge that Congress write into this measure authorization for the Department of Agriculture to set up a special division to handle

all farm labor problems; utilizing the services of existing agencies such as the U. S. Employment Service, Extension Service, and the Farm Security Administration until such a time as the program can be developed and a staff built up by the Farm Labor Division, capable of doing the job.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WAGE RATES AND HOUSING STANDARDS

As a matter of wartime necessity, we believe that Congress should write into this measure a provision for the establishment of wage rates and housing conditions for workers transported across State lines, as well as for foreign workers brought into this country.

We urge, too, that the agency handling farm labor be authorized to set up agricultural wage boards representing employers, workers, and the Government, in each region, or crop division, of the United States, and after holding public hearings set wages, regulate housing, and other conditions of employment.

USE OF PREVAILING WAGE IN A GIVEN LOCALITY

Senator McCarran. Is it your idea to set it on the prevailing wage basis?

Mr. Mitchell. Yes, sir.

Senator McCarran. We have the prevailing wage established by some authority as they have in other agencies now.

Mr. Mitchell. I do not think that will work with agriculture. I think there is so much difference in the different regions and the different crops that you cannot set a wage that will be applicable to the whole country. This country is too large.

Senator Russell. Your suggestion is that you find the prevailing wage, not that you set it, but you ascertain what it is.

Mr. Mitchell. Yes; and then see that this wage board has authority to see that it is complied with.

Such agricultural wage boards should also be given authority to stabilize wages and enforce compliance.

DIFFERENCES IN RATES OF PAY FOR SAME TYPE OF WORK

One of the constant complaints we received from our members who were at work in Florida was that different workers doing the same type of job were being paid wages varying from 30 cents an hour to 60 cents an hour.

HOUSING FACILITIES

Our people who have been out on jobs under the Farm Security Administration agreement have not found conditions such as were provided in their contracts. Housing facilities with the exception of housing provided in the F. S. A. migratory labor camps, has been uniformly bad.

The contracts they were working under provided for free housing, and those who were fortunate enough to land in an F. S. A. camp usually found that they were being forced to pay rent for the shelter they occupied.

RECOMMENDATION THAT PROGRAM NOT BE PLACED UNDER THE EXTENSION SERVICE

Our people and thousands like them throughout the South hope that the Congress will not turn over to the various State extension services authority to supply the Nation's farm labor needs. They have already been made victims of the operation of the Extension Service, which is closely allied with the American Farm Bureau Federation in the conduct of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

It is well known that in our section of the South, the county agents are largely responsible for the inflated membership figures of the Farm Bureau.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

The county agents' offices are still being used by the Farm Bureau to force a check-off of dues from A. A. A. payments and Farm Bureau dues are also collected by an involuntary check-off from crop settlements and wages of farm workers.

Last summer, we collected over 100 affidavits and statements from small farmers, tenants, and sharecroppers who had been victimized by the operation of the Farm Bureau in the States of Arkansas, Mississippi and Alabama.

Senator McCarran. You say "victimized"; just exactly what do you mean?

Mr. Mitchell. Forced to join an organization that they do not feel represents their interests, sir.

Senator McCarran. Forced, you say, to join?

Mr. Mitchell. Yes; one way or the other.

Senator Russell. How is that? You mean when there is a sharecropper's check made out, the landlord instructs him to deduct his dues?

Mr. Mitchell. Yes; and he also checks off dues from crop accounts. I would like to read one or two of these statements.

Senator Russell. All right, sir.

STATEMENT BY JOHN B. CAMPBELL, KILLENN, ALA.

Mr. Mitchell. The first is one in Alabama, John B. Campbell.

John B. Campbell, of route 1, Killenn, Ala., states that he is a tenant on the Houston plantation near Center Star; that on or about April 1, 1942, he went to the county A. A. A. office, which is located over the First National Bank in Florence, Ala., for the purpose of getting his A. A. A. check.

He was told to go across the hall and see Mrs. B. W. Conner, who is the wife of the assistant county agent and whom he understands is an employee of the A. A. A. as well.

He went across the hall into the office of the Lauderdale County Farm Bureau and when he asked Mrs. Connor for his A. A. A. check, she offered to cash it for him and asked if he was ready to pay his Farm Bureau dues for 1942. He told her that he did not belong to the Farm Bureau and did not intend to pay any dues in it.

Campbell states it is the usual practice for representatives of the county agent's office to bring A. A. A. checks out to each community and to give them out at an appointed time and place. The representatives are usually accompanied by an employee of the First National Bank of Florence who has sufficient money to cash the checks of all farmers as they receive them. A representative of the Farm Bureau or a person who is an employee of the A. A. A. also accompanies them and demands payment of membership dues.

Senator McCarran. Is that last statement corroborated at all, about taking the money to cash the checks? Is that corroborated by others?

Mr. Mitchell. Yes; it is. There is another one. Shall I read it?

Senator Russell. Perhaps you had better put it in the record.

Mr. Mitchell. I would like to read one more.

Senator Russell. You may read one more, and then put the rest in the record.

STATEMENT BY T. L. MORRISON, NEWELL, ALA.

Mr. Mitchell. There is just one right after another. There are a hundred of them.

T. L. Morrison, Newell, Ala., states that in the month of December 1941, Mr. Kermitt Harrison, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration administrator for Randolph County, was at Cedron School in beat No. 2 for the purpose of giving out Agricultural Adjustment Administration parity payments to farmers who participated in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program.

Mr. Harrison gave Morrison his check and asked him if he wanted to pay his Farm Bureau dues and if he did, Mr. Wilson would cash it for him. Morrison states that it had been many years since he had been a member of the Farm Bureau; nevertheless his check was cashed and $2 for the 1941 dues was deducted. Mr. Wilson is also an employee of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration office.

BRIEF OF AFFIDAVITS AND STATEMENTS ON THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU IN ALABAMA, ARKANSAS, AND MISSISSIPPI

(The affidavits referred to are as follows:)

A Brief of Affidavits and Statements on the American Farm Bureau in Alabama, Arkansas, and Mississippi

1. John B. Campbell, of Route 1, Killen, Ala., states that he is a tenant on the Houston plantation near Center Star; that on or about April 1, 1942, he went to the county Agricultural Adjustment Administration office, which is located over the First National Bank in Florence, Ala., for the purpose of getting his Agricultural Adjustment Administration check. He was told to go across the hall and see Mrs. B. W. Conner, who is the wife of the assistant county agent and who, he understands, is an employee of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration as well. He went across the hall into the office of the Lauderdale County Farm Bureau and when he asked Mrs. Conner for his Agricultural Adjustment Administration check, she offered to cash it for him and asked if he was ready to pay his Farm Bureau dues for 1942. He told her that he did not belong to the Farm Bureau and did not intend to pay any dues in it. Campbell states it is the usual practice for representatives of the county agent's office to bring Agricultural Adjustment Administration checks out to each community and to give them out at an appointed time and place. The representatives are usually accompanied by an employee of the First National Bank of Florence who has sufficient money to cash the checks of all farmers as they receive them. A representative of the Farm Bureau or a person who is an employee of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration also accompanies them and demands payment of membership dues.

2. T. L. Morrison, Newell, Ala., states that in the month of December 1941 Mr. Kermitt Harrison, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration administrator for Randolph County, was at Cedron School in beat No. 2, for the purpose of giving out Agricultural Adjustment Administration parity payments to farmers who participated in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program. Mr. Harrison gave Morrison his check and asked him if he wanted to pay his Farm Bureau dues and if he did, Mr. Wilson would cash it for him. Morrison states that it had been many years since he had been a member of the Farm Bureau;

nevertheless, his check was cashed and $2 for the 1941 dues was deducted. Mr. Wilson is also an employee of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration office.

3. David Brannon, Route 1, Box 47, Florence, Ala., who owns a small farm near Bailey Springs, states that on or about February 5, 1942, he went to St. Florian to see Mr. C. W. Gruber, who is one of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration committeemen for Lauderdale County, to make an application for some fertilizer which is manufactured by the Tennessee Valley Authority and distributed through the county Agricultural Adjustment Administration office free to farmers to use on their lands. Mr. Gruber told him that he would have to pay his Farm Bureau dues for 1942 if he wanted any of the fertilizer. He paid Mr. Gruber $2 and received a receipt signed by him for the year's dues in the Farm Bureau. He then took Brannon's order tor the fertilizer. About the 1st of April he received 1,000 pounds of calcium soda and 400 pounds of phosphate. He was charged $1 for delivery of the phosphate (25 cents per sack of 100 pounds). Brannon states it was his understanding that a similar charge of $5 per ton is made for delivery of calcium and that this is deducted from Agriculturad Adjustment Administration soil-conservation payments. He said that 2 years ago he also signed up for Tennessee Valley Authority fertilizer and was told that he must pay Farm Bureau dues if he wanted to get it. He did not do so and never received any fertilizer. Brannon further states that in 1940 his Agricultural Adjustment Administration check was cashed by Mrs. D. W. Connor, who is an Agricultural Adjustment Administration employee and the wife of the assistant county agent, Mr. D. W. Connor, and she deducted the 1941 dues. Brannon stated that on or about March 1, 1942, he went down to L. K. Benhauer's store in St. Florian, where the representative of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration county office were giving out Agricultural Adjustment Administration checks. His check for $15.83 was given to him by a lady whose name he does not know. Mrs. Connor was also with them and told Brannon he must pay his 1942 dues. Another man with a sack of money offered to cash his check for him. He told them he had already paid Mr. Gruber and had a receipt for this year and he didn't want his check cashed.

4. William L. Ayres, Route 3, Heflin, Ala., states he was called to the Codron School, Beat No. 2, Randolph County, to receive his Agricultural Adjustment Administration parity payment, and his check was given to him by Mr. Kermit Anderson, the Agricultural Adjustment administrator for Randolph County. Ayres endorsed it and Mr. Vernon Wilson, a clerk for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration office, cashed the Government check and deducted $2 for Farm Bureau dues for the year 1942. He protested that he did not want to join the Farm Bureau but Mr. Harrison stated he needed to be in the Farm Bureau. They kept his $2.

STATEMENTS ON THE OPERATION OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU IN ARKANSAS

1. A. Sawyer, Round Pond, Ark., states that he has made sharecrops with E. D. Belshia for 4 years and that in both 1940 and 1941 Mr. Belshia charged his account with $2.50 for dues in the Farm Bureau and that he at no time authorized anyone to pay dues in the organization. He receives regularly the newspaper published by the Bureau. Sawyer states that there are 60 families on Belshia's plantation, all of whom have been put in the Farm Bureau by the owner without their consent or knowledge.

2. John Alford, Box 62, Widener, Ark., states that he has been renting land on both cash and crop rent basis from John W. Alderson, planter and merchant of Forrest City, Ark., and that in the year 1941 Alderson, without his consent or knowledge, placed his name in the Farm Bureau and charged him with $2.50 dues which were deducted from the amount due him on his crop.

3. Fred Terry and his son, Eugene, employed as sharecroppers on land belonging to Fussell Graham Alderson Co., merchants and planters of Forrest City, in a joint statement say that $2.50 was charged each of them and later collected from their accounts for 1941. Their first knowledge of their membership came to them when they began receiving the Farm Bureau magazine. The Terrys live at North Route 2, Widener, Ark.

4. Hugh Hanna, Forrest City, Ark., Route 2, Box 333, states that he was a sharecropper on the farm owned and operated by Jess Huestess in 1941, and that Huestess put all of his labor in the Farm Bureau and charged them $2.50 and the amount was collected from each sharecropper upon settlement being made for the 1941 crops. There are 22 families on this plantation and all receive copies of the

Farm Bureau paper. This affidavit is also signed by C. T. Brooks, O'Dell Porter, James G. Guess, G. E. Patton, and Henry Bowden, all employed by Huestess.

5. An affidavit made by Ernest Sanford states that he has farmed since 1939 on the plantation owned by Charley Huestess and that dues were collected on his crop account in 1941. Sanford's address is Route 2, Box 104, Forrest City, Ark.

6. Oscar M. Gowen states that Sweet Bros., of Widener, Ark., put him in the Farm Bureau in 1941 without his consent or knowledge and collected dues of $2.50 at the time settlement was made on his crop account. McGowen receives a copy of the Farm Bureau paper regularly. His address is Route 2, Box 149, Widener, Ark.

7. George Smith, Route 2, Box 63, Forrest City, Ark., states that he made a sharecrop on the farm belonging to E. D. Hedge, 6 miles west of Forrest City, in 1941, and that Hodge put him in the Farm Bureau and collected $2.50 when his crop account was settled. He receives the Farm Bureau magazine.

8. John Garrett, Route 2, Box 72, Forrest City, Ark., states that he farmed in 1941 on a plantation owned by D. Chlendorf, of Grider, Mississippi County, Ark., and that he and his brother, also employed by Chlendorf, were forced to pay $2.50 each as Farm Bureau dues. He received as evidence of membership a copy of the Farm Bureau paper.

9. Dan Turner, of Forrest City, states that he made a sharecrop in 1941 with C. F. Tyson of Widener, Ark., and that Tyson put him in the Farm Bureau and later told him that unless he joined the Bureau he would not receive Government subsidy payment under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program. Turner was charged with $2.50 dues.

10. Alf Belden, Whitemore, Ark., states that on the 21st day of January 1942 his landlord, H. C. Grovers, of Heth, St. Francis County, Ark. told him that he had paid his 1941 Farm Bureau dues. He states he protested against paying his money into an organization which did not benefit him but that Grovers deducted $2.50 for 1 year's dues when his final settlement was made, sometime later.

11. Mose Carruthers, Box 27, Howell, Woodruff County, Ark. states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau and that his landlord told him that he must join if he wished to continue getting parity payments and that he offered to pay one-half of his first year's dues; however, $2.50 was charged to his credit account. He has been a member for 10 months, has never attended meetings nor does he know when meetings are held.

* * * * * * *

20. George Rice, Route 1, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau and that his landlord paid his dues for him and charged the same to his account. R. M. Brown, Cotton Plant, Ark., is the landlord.

21. Cicero Stovall, Route 1, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau and has been for about 1 year and that his landlord put him in and charged $2.50 to his account. He was told that he had to belong to the Bureau if he wanted to farm on the same place in 1942. C. M. McGowan, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

22. Julius Brown, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. R. A. Powell, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

23. W. J. Reed, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. Mrs. T. C. Carter is the landlord.

24. Fred Dean, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. Mrs. T. C. Carter is the landlord.

25. Morris Jones, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and notified him that he was a member and charged $2.50 to his account. C. M. McGowan, Cotton, Plant, is the landlord.

26. Alex Edmonds, Route 1, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau and has been for about 1 year and that his landlord put him in and charged $2.50 to his account. He was told that he had to belong to the Bureau if he wanted to farm on the same place in 1942. R. M. Brown, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

27. B. C. Griffin, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941; notified him that he was a member and charged $2.50 to his account. Mrs. T. C. Carter, Cotton Plant, Ark., is the landlord.

28. M. D. Ivry, Route 1, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941, notified him that he was a member, and charged $2.50 to his account. Mrs. T. C. Carter, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

29. B. L. Reed, Route 1, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941, notified him that he was a member, and charged $2.50 to his account. Mrs. T. C. Carter, Cotton Plant, Ark., is the landlord.

30. H. B. Lee, Route 1, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau and has been for about 1 year and that his landlord put him in and charged $2.50 to his account. He was told that he had to belong to the Bureau if he wanted to farm on the same place in 1942. Mrs. T. C. Carter, Cotton Plant, Ark., is the landlord.

31. Tobe Prater, Route 1, Box 35, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. R. M. Brown, Cotton Plant, is the owner.

32. A. L. Stovall, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his due for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. J. D. McGreger, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

33. Forrest Dean, Route 1, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau and has been for about 1 year and that his landlord put him in and charged $2.50 to his account. He was told that he had to belong to the Bureau if he wanted to farm on the same place in 1942. Mrs. T. C. Carter, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

34. Cleo Flanagan, Route 1, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. J. D. McGregor, of Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

35. Elmer Johnson, Route 1, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. Mrs. T. C. Carter, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

36. Richard Jones, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. J. H. McCloud, Cotton Plant is the landlord.

37. J. T. Williams, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. J. H. McCloud, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

38. Willie Mathkins, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. Mrs. T. C. Carter, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

39. M. C. Dean, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau and has been for about 1 year and that his landlord put him in and charged $2.50 to his account. He was told that he had to belong to the Bureau if he wanted to farm on the same place in 1942. Mrs. T. C. Carter, of Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

40. Walter Davis, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. Mr. J. H. McCloud, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

41. Leroy Malvin, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. R. A. Powell, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

42. S. C. Betton, Route 1, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. C. M. McGowan, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

43. Willie Adkins, Route 1, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord put him in and charged $2.50 to his account. He was told that he had to belong to the bureau if he wanted to farm on the same place in 1942. Mrs. T. C. Carter, Cotton, Plant, is the landlord.

44. S. Harris, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. J. H. McCloud, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

45. Mose Kelley, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau for about 1 year and that his landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. J. H. McCloud, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

46. Hays Prince, Route 1, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau and has been for about 1 year and that his landlord put him in and charged $2.50 to his account. He was told that he had to belong to the bureau if he wanted to farm on the same place in 1942. Mrs. Nettie McGowan, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

47. Cleo Bullock, Route 1, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau and has been for about 1 year. His landlord paid his dues for 1941 and then notified him that he was a member. Mrs. T. C. Carter, Cotton Plant, is the landlord.

48. Bonnie Holcolm, Howell, Ark., employed as a sharecropper on L. L. Cole & Son plantation, states he is a member of the American Farm Bureau, that one-half of his dues of $2.50 were paid by L. L. Cole and the balance charged to his account. He received a membership card for 1941.

49. Mose Duckins, Howell, Ark., employed as a sharecropper on L. L. Cole & Son plantation, states he is a member of the American Farm Bureau, that one-half of his dues of $2.50 were paid by L. L. Cole and the balance charged to his account. He received a membership card for 1941.

50. W. H. Holliday, Howell, Ark., employed as a sharecropper on L. L. Cole & Son plantation, states he is a member of the Farm Bureau, that one-fourth of his dues of $2.50 were paid by L. L. Cole and three-fourths charged to his account. He received a membership card for 1941.

51. A. G. Taylor, Howell, Ark., employed as a sharecropper on L. L. Cole & Son plantation. states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that one-half of his dues of $2.50 were paid by L. L. Cole and the balance charged to his account. He received a membership card for 1941.

52. Rolen Gant, Howell, Ark., employed as a sharecropper on L. L. Cole & Son plantation, states he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that one-half of his dues of $2.50 were paid by L. L. Cole and the balance charged to his account. He received a membership card for 1941.

53. Warren Carroll, Howell, Ark., employed as a sharecropper on L. L. Cole & Son plantation states he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that one-half of his dues of $2.50 were paid by L. L. Cole and the balance charged to his account. He received a membership card for 1941.

54. Earl Munns, Howell, Ark., employed as a sharecropper on L. L. Cole & Son plantation, states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that one-half of his dues of $2.50 were paid by L. L. Cole and the balance charged to his account. He received a membership card for 1941.

55. Will Holms, Howell, Ark., employed as a sharecropper on L. L. Cole & Son plantation, states he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that one-half of his dues of $2.50 were paid by L. L. Cole and the balance charged to his account. He received a membership card for 1941.

56. Walter Clark, Howell, Ark., employed as a sharecropper on L. L. Cole & Son plantation, states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that one-half of his dues of $2.50 were paid by L. L. Cole and the balance charged to his his account. He received a membership card for 1941.

57. Marshall Nelson, Howell, Ark., employed as a sharecropper on L. L. Cole & Son plantation, states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that one-half of his dues of $2.50 were paid by L. L. Cole and the balance charged to his account with 10 percent interest. He received a membership card for 1941.

58. Jimmie Barnes, Howell, Ark., employed as a sharecropper on L. L. Cole & Son plantation, states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that one-half of his dues of $2.50 were paid by L. L. Cole and the balance charged to his account. He received a membership card for 1941.

59. Stretter George, Howell, Ark., employed as a sharecropper on L. L. Cole & Son plantation, states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that one-half

of his dues of $2.50 were paid by L. L. Cole and the balance charged to his account. He received a membership card for 1941.

60. James Brock, Howell, Ark., employed as a sharecropper on L. L. Cole & Son plantation, states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that one-half of his dues of $2.50 were paid by L. L. Cole and the balance charged to his account. He received a membership card for 1941.

61. Manuel Holcom, Howell, Ark., employed as a sharecropper on L. L. Cole & Son plantation, states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that one-fourth of his dues of $2.50 were paid by L. L. Cole and three-fourths charged to his account. He received a membership for 1941.

62. Pindleton Mosby, Kinton, Ark., employed on a plantation of Theo Bonds, states he was put in the Farm Bureau by his landlord 3 years ago and that he has been charged with $2.50 dues each year on his crop account.

63. Walter A. Wiley, Box 77, Widener, Ark., states that he did not know he was a member of the Farm Bureau until he received a membership card and a button. For 2 years, however, $2.50 had been charged to his account and collected when crop settlements were made.

64. St. Clair Stevenson, Route 1, Box 123 A, Gould, Ark., states that he has been a member of the Farm Bureau 1 year and that $2.50 per year dues are paid by his landlord but charged to his crop account.

65. Henry Pulee, Cotton Plant, Ark., states he has never joined the Farm Bureau but received a membership card for 1941; who paid for it he does not know.

66. Marcus Green, Widener, Ark., states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that his landlord put him in without his knowledge, and that he did not know he was a member until he began receiving a paper. Later he found that he had to pay $2.50 per year, which has been charged to his credit account.

67. Oscar Brown, Widener, Ark., states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that his landlord put him in without his knowledge, and that he did not know he was a member until he began receiving a paper. Later he found that he had to pay $2.50 per year dues, which had been charged to his credit account.

68. Ned Love, Widener, Ark., states he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that his landlord put him in without his knowledge, and that he did not know he was a member until he began receiving a paper. Later he found that he had paid $2.50 per year dues which had been charged to his credit account.

69. Richard White, Route 1, Cotton Plant, Ark., states that during the year of 1941 he was employed by Mr. J. D. McGregor as a tenant farmer and that on or about January 1, 1941, Mr. McGregor told him that he had paid his Farm Bureau dues of $2.50 and he refused to accept the Farm Bureau membership card. Mr. McGregor then notified him that his contract would expire January 1, 1942, and that he would have to move unless he accepted the Farm Bureau membership. White states that on or about the 6th day of January 1942 he moved to the place where he is now living. He says he does not consider that the Farm Bureau in any way represents his interests. He is a Negro.

70. George Bryant, Howell, Ark., states he was forced to join the Farm Bureau by Andrew Comer, who deducted $2.50 from his crop account.

71. Archie Nevels, Howell, Ark., states that his landord, L. L. Cole, put him in the Farm Bureau and that 1 year's dues of $2.50 was taken out of his crop settlement when his cotton was sold.

72. Lige Powell, Howell, Ark., states that his landlord, L. L. Cole, put him in the Farm Bureau and charged him three-fourths of a year's dues of of $2.50.

73. Harry Taylor, Howell, Ark., states that his landlord, L. L. Cole, put him in the Farm Bureau and charged him three-fourths of a year's dues of $2.50.

74. Luke Goodall, Route 1, Box 372, Widener, Ark., states that he was put in the Farm Bureau by George Burnett, who put all of the laborers on his place in the Farm Bureau. He does not know whether dues were charged to his account or not. The first knowledge he had of his being a Farm Bureau member was when he began receiving the Farm Bureau paper.

75. James Taylor, Round Pond, Ark., states that he was employed on the farm belonging to Ed Belcher, who put him in the Farm Bureau in 1940, 1941, and 1942 without his consent; that $2.50 each year was charged to his crop account and collected from the proceeds of his crop. He states he does not like it as he is a member of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, and has not received any benefits from the Farm Bureau and is not allowed to meet with them.

76. Jim Sisk, St. Francis County, Ark., states that on or about April 1940,

Mr. L. B. Jones of Madison, Ark., one of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration county committee members, put him in the Farm Bureau and charged membership dues to his crop account and collected $2.50 from his crop settlement. He further states that Mr. Jones has never said anything to him about joining the Farm Bureau; that he has been a member of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union for 6 years and does not care anything about the Farm Bureau and their Farm Bureau papers because it does not mean anything to him or any other sharecropper; that he was put into the Farm Bureau without his knowledge and objects to the Farm Bureau.

77. George Sisson, St. Francis County, Ark., states that on or about March 1, 1941, Mr. L. B. Jones, of Madison, Ark., put him in the Farm Bureau without his willingness to join but tried to make him believe it was the thing for all of the laborers to do so that cotton prices would be higher. He states he received less than the market price for cotton and was charged $2.50 membership dues which was collected out of the 1941 crop settlement. He received the Farm Bureau paper but states he has not benefited at all by the Farm Bureau.

78. M. H. Hawkins, who lives near Howell, Woodruff County, Ark., on a farm belonging to L. L. Cole & Son, states that on or about May 15, 1941, Mr. Cole called him into his office and told him that all of this tenants and sharecroppers had been put in the Farm Bureau and that he put him in too. Hawkins says he told Mr. Cole he didn't know anything about the Farm Bureau and did not want to join. Cole replied that there was an Agricultural Adjustment Administration check being held up and in order to get it, all of us had to become members of the bureau; that if he got all of them in, they would get $20 more per bale on their cotton in the fall. Hawkins states that when the cotton was sold, they received less than the market price. He states he was charged three-fourths of the yearly dues of $2.50 on his crop account and that on January 15, 1942, he was notified by Mr. R. L. Cole that if he did not accept Farm Bureau membership in 1942 he must move. He told him he would not be a member and after 2 months was told he could go ahead and make a crop this year.

STATEMENTS ON THE OPERATION OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU IN MISSISSIPPI

1. Santos Varona, a Mexican employed on the Wilderson plantation near Clarksdale, Miss., during 1938 and 1939, states that the manager of this plantation put all sharecroppers and day laborers employed on his place in the Farm Bureau and deducted dues from their crop settlements and day wages. Varona was also charged $10 for what he understood to be a "living tax." During 1940 and 1941 Santos Varona was employed on farm owned by the Bruce Lumber Co., near Shelby, Miss., and states that all labor hired on this plantation was required to join the Farm Bureau. Varona received regularly a copy of the American Farm Bureau magazine.

2. T. N. Watson made a sharecrop in 1941 with Martin Burns of Hillhouse, Miss. All men on the place were put in the Farm Bureau and Watson believes that dues were collected at the time his settlement was made for his crop. Burns charged Watson $29.37 for his services as a farm supervisor.

3. Mrs. E. M. Moore, a widow, made a sharecrop in 1941 with Martin Burns, of Hillhouse, Miss. She states that the Farm Bureau dues were included in her account. She was charged with $51.44 for farm supervision.

4. Mose Mathews, of Stringtown, Bolivar County, Miss., states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau and that his landlord told him that he had to join the Farm Bureau if he was to get his Government checks under Agricultural Adjustment Administration, that his dues of $3 per year were checked off when his settlement for his crop account was made. Further that the landlord paid for him each year. He has been a member of the Farm Bureau for 3 years. He has never attended a meeting, he does not know when meetings are held; he never took part in an election or at any time engaged in any discussion of the program or policy of the organization. Mathews is a Negro. C. D. Terrell is the owner of the plantation.

5. Jack Blair, of Stringtown, Bolivar County, Miss. states that he is a member of the American Farm Bureau and that he has been for 3 years. He was told by his landlord that unless he kept up his membership in the bureau he would have to move. His dues are checked off when settlement is made for his crop account, the $3 being paid by his landlord. He has never attended a meeting; he does not know when meetings are held; he has never taken part

in an election for officers or in any way participated in a discussion on the program or policy of the organization. Blair is a Negro. C. D. Terrell is the owner of the plantation.

6. Judge Mitchell, of Stringtown, Bolivar County, Miss., is a day laborer and he was forced to pay $3 per year dues in the Farm Bureau by his landlord who deducted $2 at one time and $1 later from his wages. He has never attended a meeting. He protested and was told that the reason for belonging to the bureau was that wages and the price of cotton would be higher. Mitchell is a Negro. C. C. Terrell is the owner of the plantation.

7. G. W. Lipsey, Stringtown, Bolivar County, Miss., states that Mose Mathes, Shorty Williams, Judge Mitchell, Wash Wigfail, Robert Severson, Claude Grant, J. H. Cristell, A. C. Sims, B. M. Lancaster, Jr., Horace Campbell, Johnny Jones, Cass Jones, R. L. Kimbrough, and Will Riley, all of Stringtown, are members of the Farm Bureau and that they were put in the organization without their consent and that dues were deducted from Government subsidy payments and crop settlements. All are Negroes. Lepsey further states that nearly every Negro that he knows in Bolivar County is a member of the Farm Bureau.

8. James Archer, Clarksdale, Cahoma County, Miss., states that he is a member of the Farm Bureau; that Mr. Jim Kline, on whose plantation he is employed, put him in the organization without his consent or knowledge about 2 years ago and that his 1941 dues were collected by Mr. Kline when settlement was made for his crop. Archer is a Negro.

9. Alex Johnson, Route 3, Clarksdale, Miss., states that he is employed as a sharecropper on the plantation owned and operated by Jim Kline, of Clarksdale, and works on a share basis of 60 percent to the landlord and 40 percent to the cropper. Johnson was told to join the Farm Bureau and secure equal rights and refused to do so. Kline then, without his knowledge, put his name in as a member and in January 1941 and in February 1942 collected dues of $2 per year out of his Government check.

10. Charley Johnson, Deason, Sunflower County, Miss., states that he is a tenant on the Delta Pine & Land Co., whose headquarters are at Scott, Miss., and whose general manager is Mr. Oscar Johnson, and that for the past 3 years Farm Bureau membership dues have been deducted at the time his crop settlement was made, the last deduction being made in 1941 for $2. Johnson states tha the never attends meetings and does not know if or when they are held.

11. Osie Johnson, Duncan, Sunflower County, Miss., states that he has been a member of the American Farm Bureau for the years 1940, 1941, 1942 and that he was told that if he joined, he would receive more for his cotton and would also receive Government payments. He is employed by the Robert Wolf plantation near Duncan, Miss.

12. Nelson Gardener, Perthshire, Miss., is a sharecropper on the plantation of M. L. Knowlton. He states that Mr. Knowlton deducted Farm Bureau dues out of his 1941 Agricultural Adjustment Administration parity check.

13. Verd Washington, Route 1, Box 62, Shelby, Miss., is a sharecropper on the plantation of M. L. Knowlton. He states that Mr. Knowlton deducted $2 Farm Bureau dues out of his 1941 Agricultural Adjustment Administration parity check.

14. E. H. Meeks, Shelby, Miss., is a sharecropper on the plantation of Douglas Brooks and states that his landloard collected both 1941 and 1942 Farm Bureau dues from his Agricultural Adjustment Administration parity checks.

15. Rich Thomas, Route 1, Box 62, Shelby, Miss., is a sharecropper on the plantation of M. L. Knowlton. He states that Mr. Knowlton deducted $2 Farm Bureau dues out of his 1941 Agricultural Adjustment Administration parity check.

16. A. D. Maberry, Shelby, Miss., is a sharecropper on the plantation of Douglas Brooks and states that his landloard collected both 1941 and 1942 Farm Bureau dues from his Agricultural Adjustment Administration parity checks.

17. John Francis Hynds states that he is employed as a field investigator for the Southern Tenant Farmers Union. On March 29, 1942, he was sent to the Mississippi Delta for the purpose of making an investigation of reported injustices to sharecroppers and tenants on cotton plantations in that section.

He personally checked the records of one T. M. Watkins, a tenant on the plantation of Martin Burns, of Hillhouse, Miss. Watkins was forced by his landlord to gin his cotton at the gin of R. L. Cox & Co. at Bobo. He was charged by R. L. Cox & Co., 35 cents per 100 pounds for ginning, and $2.50 per bale for bagging and ties. He was paid $45 and $48 per ton for cottonseed.

He also checked the records of W. B. Holland, a client of the Farm Security Administration at Hillhouse, Miss., and found that Holland was charged 20 cents per 100 for ginning and $1.50 for bagging and ties at the same gin, and further that he was paid by R. L. Cox & Co. $50 and $53 per ton for cottonseed. Also he found that these differences in gin rates prevailed wherever independent farmers ginned their cotton at R. L. Cox & Co.

He also found that T. M. Watkins, Mrs. E. M. Moore, and other tenants on the plantation of Martin Burns were charged 17 percent interest on their accounts, this item being entered on the accounts as "supervision." Watkins was charged $55 per ton for fertilizer whereas the same kind of fertilizer was delivered to nearby farms and plantations at the rate of $35 per ton.

Senator RUSSELL. All of those people were white people, were they not?

Mr. MITCHELL. Those two that I read. But some were Negroes and some were white.

Senator RUSSELL. Is it your contention then that they take Negroes into the Farm Bureau?

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, yes; they do. In fact, I know in some counties in the Mississippi Delta 90 percent of the members of the Farm Bureau are Negroes, because all of them are in it, and the population figures are about the same. However, they do not have any rights as members in it.

Senator RUSSELL. Do you think that is very widespread, Mr. Mitchell?

Mr. MITCHELL. I know it is a widespread practice.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, I had heard some complaints from Alabama about it, but I had not heard any from any other State.

Mr. MITCHELL. That certainly is true of Arkansas, and Mississippi as well. Those affidavits come from those three States.

Senator RUSSELL. I tried to make some investigation in my own State, and I have not found any cases.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understand the Farm Bureau is just starting in your State?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, they have been down there about 3 years.

Mr. MITCHELL. Have they?

Senator MCCARRAN. That is the Farm Bureau Federation, is it not?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is right.

Just before I left home I was handed a form letter dated March 5, which was being sent out in the Mississippi counties, listing the membership in the Farm Bureau.

It will be noted that this form letter asked the farmer to make out a check for his farm bureau dues and return it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. The return envelope is addressed to I. W. Carson, county agent, Lexington, Miss.

The person who gave me this letter stated that it appeared that the letters of the A. A. A. were being used in its circulation, and that nearly every other farmer he knew had received this letter.

I would also like to turn this over to you, if you do not mind.

Senator MCCARAN. Very well. Hand it to the reporter.

(The material above referred to is as follows:)

Envelope addressed to:

I. W. CARSON,
County Agent, Lexington, Miss.

MR. FARMER!

Include

FARM ORGANIZATION

In Your 1943 Farm Plans

MISSISSIPPI FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Jackson, Mississippi

THE 1943 TEN-POINT PROGRAM OF THE MISSISSIPPI FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

1. Cooperate 100 percent in the war effort and strive untiringly to reach all agricultural war goals.
2. 45,000 members; 75 county organizations.
3. Sell one million ($1,000,000) dollars in war bonds by April 30th.
4. Purchase building in Jackson for State headquarters.
5. Develop more community organizations and neighborhood discussion groups.
6. Promote home food production and increased production of food and fiber for the war program.
7. Get farm issues before the people in the 1943 elections in Mississippi and seek to get candidates to include a worth-while farm program in their platforms.
8. Work for the preservation of "State rights" in all fields and especially seek to preserve the integrity of the "Land Grant College System" in the field of agriculture.
9. Fight to preserve and defend Democracy against all enemies and "isms" whether they be in foreign lands or at home.
10. Conduct a vigorous campaign to get essential national legislation especially in the following fields:

(*a*) Secure a fair relative farm price by revising the parity formula so as to include the increased cost of farm labor.

(*b*) Recognize farming as an essential war industry and stop the drain of manpower from the farms.

(*c*) Secure the essential minimum requirements of farm machinery.

(*d*) Obtain a fair and proper distribution of available fertilizer.

(*e*) Provide essential transportation requirements for farmers.

(*f*) Abolish the two-price system of peanuts and provide to market the entire crop at a price floor of 85 percent of parity.

(*g*) Cut red tape to a minimum, and stop altogether regulations and requirements which waste time, hinder production, confuse farmers, or penalize producers for failing to do things beyond their control.

(*h*) Cut all appropriations and unnecessary expenditures to a minimum.

Here Is What the Farm Bureau Did for You in 1942

1. Full cooperation with the war-food program for agriculture.
2. Cooperation and leadership in scrap campaigns and War bond sales.
3. Obtained 90-percent loan for basic crops (cotton).
4. Secured Steagall amendment, giving price protection to nonbasic commodities.
5. Supported reduction of nonessential Government spending.
6. Consistently opposed changing "AmericanISM" for any other kind of "ISM."
7. Opposed selling Government-owned farm commodities at subparity prices.
8. Obtained recognition of agriculture on the War Manpower Commission.
9. Supported legislation to prevent racketeering in any form; especially racketeering under the cloak of Government protection.
10. Worked consistently for adequate machinery, fertilizer, transportation, manpower, and good credit so that farmers could meet war goals.
11. Opposed efforts of John L. Lewis to organize farmers; and also opposed efforts of the Government to force migrant Mexican workers to organize.
12. Opposed establishment of minimum wages and hours regulation for the farm.

13. Maintained in Washington at all times a strong organization to represent farmers, to fight for farm rights, and to demand for agriculture equality and justice.

No. _____ _____, Miss., _____194____

_____ Pay to the order of

HOLMES COUNTY FARM BUREAU

Two and no/100_____ Dollars

and Charge to the Account of

To_____ } _____
_____ }

HOLMES COUNTY FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Lexington, Miss., March 5, 1943.

To Farmers of Holmes County:

The Farm Bureau Federation is the farmer's only channel through which he can directly contact his national legislative body on matters pertaining to his needs and just dues. You have kept up with the various good things that have come out of national legislation benefiting the farmer; 90 percent parity loan on cotton, $50 per ton as a minimum price on cottonseed, and other worthwhile things with which you are familiar. These benefits have been made possible through representatives our Farm Bureau has been able to keep in Washington.

Some day this horrible war will be over, and if the farmer is not organized we will possibly be right back where we were in 1932.

I am enclosing a draft for you to finish filling out in the amount of $2 covering your Farm Bureau annual dues. Fill in the name of your bank, date, sign, and return to me at once—using the enclosed self-addressed envelope. You will never spend $2 that will pay you a greater return since your money and membership will help to keep representatives before the National Congress to look after our needs.

Read the enclosed pamphlet, it will tell you about your organization.

Yours very truly,

H. L. NICHOLS,
President, Holmes County Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. MITCHELL. We urge that whatever legislation be adopted provide that the farm workers be given the right to join or not to join a farm organization or union. We are quite content if they just have the privilege of joining. We do not ask any Government agency to check off dues for the Southern Tenant Farmers Union.

Senator RUSSELL. You think then this amounts to a check-off of Farm Bureau dues?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes. And, I think if any of these people go out to work in other areas they will be members of the Farm Bureau, one way or the other. That is just a matter of opinion, of course.

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Mitchell, I owe you an apology, and I want to make it before the committee. I wired you that we were going to conclude this hearing today, but we cannot possibly do it. I am sorry to have inconvenienced you for coming in before Thursday.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, we did want an opportunity for the representatives of our organization from the different States to come in and give you their views. If it could be arranged by that time, it would be greatly appreciated.

Senator RUSSELL. We will undertake to hear from a couple of them. We could not hear from every State, Mr. Mitchell. If we started with any such system as that, the committee would never get through.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is right.

Senator RUSSELL. So, we will hear from a couple of them briefly; not as lengthy a statement as yours, perhaps, and we will hear from them on Thursday.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am sure I could get them up here at that time.

Senator RUSSELL. If they cannot come, and if they will submit a typewritten statement setting forth their views, that will be made available to the committee as well as the members of the Senate.

Mr. MITCHELL. Our organization in our last meeting, executive council meeting, elected a delegation to present our views, and I was a member of the delegation. In brief I have outlined our position. These other members would give you statements of their personal experience in the matter.

Senator RUSSELL. All right, sir. Are you a native of Memphis, Mr. Mitchell?

Mr. MITCHELL. No; I am not a native of Memphis. I am a native of Tennessee.

Senator RUSSELL. We have appreciated very much your splendid statement.

STATEMENT BY ROBERT HANDSCHIN, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Handschin of the National Farmers Union has been before the committee before on other matters. We will be glad to hear your views on this legislation, Mr. Handschin.

Mr. HANDSCHIN. Thank you, Senator, and members of the committee. I will try to be brief but this is a rather involved matter.

I would like to try to answer, in the course of what I have to say, these questions which seem to me to be the ones before the committee.

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE

The first question is: Will we be able to have enough labor this coming crop season at the right place and at the right time?

The second question is: What is necessary in order to recruit, and transport and mobilize that labor?

The third question is: Should this be a Federally controlled, or State and local controlled program?

The fourth question is: How much money should we provide in order to do the job?

Senator RUSSELL. Will you give me that second question again, please?

Mr. HANDSCHIN. What are the necessary conditions for us to be able to locate, recruit, mobilize, move, and train labor to make it available?

DRAFT DEFERMENT FOR FARM WORKERS

We have been interested in this entire problem since more than a year ago. We first started out to get some improvement in the draft deferment for farmers and farm workers and, jointly with the other

organizations, finally succeeded in doing a little along that line, after considerable damage had been done.

By early last fall, we came to realize that the problem facing our farm people was not prices but a manpower, machinery, fertilizer, and feed problem. We needed some kind of an inventory, an overall plan made for our manpower requirements, and some kind of a way for organizing the manpower, just as you would organize the supply of farm machinery.

Now, we know this is a big problem and that we are late in getting to it. We know that it has been a responsibility which has been unassigned, as far as Congress has been concerned, until this day and that in the meantime it was for a while in the Employment Service, and then under the War Manpower Commission, and quite recently under the Department of Agriculture.

LACK OF ADEQUATE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FARM LABOR

In years past, the Department of Agriculture had no interest in farm labor. If you will go back through the appropriations, the sum total of moneys over the last 50 years that have ever been appropriated by the Federal Government for anything connected with farm labor, certainly does not exceed four or five million dollars, and almost all of that has been appropriated in the past few years.

Before that time, you could hardly find a red cent that was appropriated for anything connected with farm labor, other than the collection of a few statistics along with the crop reports. This labor problem has never received attention before, except during 1918 and 1919. We started to do some things in those years, but the war ended, and we did not have to go very far.

LOSS OF HIGH REGARD FOR THE HIRED MAN

In the meantime, we had an increasing surplus of farm labor, in most parts of the country. We have highly skilled workers with less opportunity to move into industry or into farming. Farm people lost much of the high regard that they once had for the hired man.

Too many farm people came to look upon the man, the child, or the woman hired to work for them as something less than the machinery or the fertilizer or the other production materials on their farms.

We think that is bad. We think that some way, somehow, over the long pull, you must keep real incentives for people if they are to be good hired workers.

Senator RUSSELL. What do you attribute that to?

Mr. HANDSCHIN. I attribute that to the lack of opportunity to engage in farming. In these days almost everyone becomes a farmer by inheriting a farm, or by marriage. The number who can buy farms is getting smaller and smaller. We are on the way to having a permanent class of farm workers in this country. It is high time we begin to realize that the agricultural ladder is no longer operating as a way up but only as a way to go down. There is no longer a proper incentive for farm workers to do a good job and to be sound and upright citizens. We must substitute—if we are going to have agriculture

that requires hired persons—some status as hired laborers which will assure a sound and healthy group of people doing that kind of work.

That is what happened in Europe. I do not like to draw comparisons with Europe, and we hope our Nation is not going to do what Europe did, but for the last couple of decades in western Europe the status of the agricultural laborer has been higher than it has been in this country.

Senator RUSSELL. You mean, it is no longer the hired man residing in the home and living there with his family?

Mr. HANDSCHIN. That is it, Senator. Of course, some of the appearances are still here, but more and more labor in agriculture is employed on a day-to-day basis and is not taken into the family. Workers may or may not live on the farm. Where they do live on the farm, it is not as it was before; that is, taken into the family. That is unfortunate, but it is the fact.

Senator RUSSELL. Has that been due to the change of attitude of the farm families that own or operate the farms, or has the farm labor deteriorated? Have the better ones gone out and left the farm?

Mr. HANDSCHIN. There is something to that suggestion, Senator, I am sure, but I think the over-all picture is that we no longer have the same opportunity for men to begin farming, for competition between men to find out who can be a good farmer and who cannot. Farming is settling down more and more so that no newcomer has a chance to come up the ladder. One of the boys in the family will inherit the farm, or maybe two of them.

Senator NYE. Mr. Handschin, after the last war, when the terrible distress set in upon American agriculture, did not that contribute largely to the last days of the hired man, as we used to know him?

Mr. HANDSCHIN. That is true, and mechanization also was a factor.

Senator NYE. There was not the ability to afford the kind of men that they once did maintain on the farm.

Mr. HANDSCHIN. That is very true, Senator, especially during the depression. During the depression, farm wages sank far more than city wages did.

Senator NYE. They did.

Mr. HANDSCHIN. With a few exceptions, the plight of landless country people was worse than the plight of the unemployed in the cities, even though the people in the country were working part of the time. I do not want to take up more time on this background unless there is some further question.

Senator RUSSELL. I perhaps should not have gone into it so, but the hired man is so familiar in song and story that I hate to see him pass into oblivion.

Mr. HANDSCHIN. Senator, he has not passed into oblivion out in the Middle West where the term hired man was most commonly used and is still used. A good many things might make you thing that not very much has happened to him, but when you go right out and see for yourself, there has been a very considerable change in the status of the hired man as compared to 20 or 30 years ago.

Senator BROOKS. Is that caused by mechanized farming and the requirement of hired men on the farm to have motor vehicles of their own, and they cannot accumulate enough so that they can own their own farms?

Mr. HANDSCHIN. Senator Brooks, when a man no longer believes that if he will only save his money he can purchase a farm or make a down payment, or get the tools and equipment to become a tenant, he is inclined to consider himself a wage worker for life, and he is going to take the same attitude toward his work as the man employed in the city does.

The man employed in the city may try to purchase a home for himself, but not in many cases will he try to purchase a small business. He will only if there is opportunity.

In Illinois, for instance, at the present time the average of the farm-purchase loans made by Farm Security is better than $10,000. A man has 40 years to repay, although he may repay in less than that. There was a time when land sold for a dollar and a quarter. Now it is two to three hundred dollars an acre.

There is your real story. The hired man spends his money on a second-hand jalopy, because we haven't made the way, and the way is not there for him to become a farm operator, even a tenant.

While this is a budget to furnish hired labor, we should not forget that the manpower in agriculture includes all of the people who work in agriculture, those who are unpaid as well as those who are paid.

We have close to 4,000,000 farms which do not have enough livestock, enough capital, enough land, enough credit, and in some cases the right farming methods to utilize fully the labor already on those farms. If we want to increase farm production, we ought to look to these underemployed farm people, where with the least possible disturbance and in the shortest space of time they can use their manpower. That, however, will not furnish us a supply of hired labor.

TYPES OF ACTIVITIES TO BE UNDERTAKEN UNDER JOINT RESOLUTION AS PASSED BY HOUSE

In the Budget request there are six or seven different types of activities outlined.

First, a program to mobilize the people on farms and off farms in the local communities and counties.

Secondly, the proposal to mobilize a large number of our young people, to be taken perhaps some short distance up to 100 miles, to work all summer on one farm.

NEED FOR YEAR-AROUND PERMANENT HIRED MEN

Thirdly, the proposal to find upward of 50,000 year-around, permanent hired men, which involves two different situations.

We have a great many farm families where the last of three or four boys were taken into the Army last fall or winter, leaving a father 60 or 70 years of age faced with the problem of finding a year-round hired man for the first time in all his years of farming.

Such farmers are in worse shape than farmers who in the past have farmed with year-round hired labor. While they have the problem of replacing some of their help, they are, at least, accustomed to using hired men.

OTHER ACTIVITIES CONTEMPLATED UNDER JOINT RESOLUTION AS PASSED BY HOUSE

The fourth proposal is for labor to follow the crops as they mature. This, too, has two parts.

On the one hand, some workers may be employed very nearly the year around by working crops from south to north and back. These workers are permanent, full-time agricultural workers.

On the other hand, farm people, who are not too far off, can come into the midwinter cropping areas and work between their own crop seasons. That is a separate problem, because you are dealing with a person who is a farmer, who is going to remain a farmer, who is going back to his home but who is available for 2 or 3 or 4 months.

IMPORTATION OF FARM LABOR

Fifth, a program to import such foreign workers as we may find, and to use such aliens now in the country or who may come into the country as war prisoners.

CHANCE SLIGHT FOR FILLING MIGRATORY LABOR NEEDS FROM FOREIGN SOURCES

We see very little chance of fulfilling our needs for migratory labor from foreign sources alone. The west coast needs around 150,000. The Mississippi Valley needs in the neighborhood of 50,000 workers. The east coast needs from 100,000 to 150,000.

Lastly, in the budget there was a provision requesting funds to encourage investigation of labor-saving methods in agriculture.

LOCAL COMMUNITY MOBILIZATION CAN BE EFFECTIVELY CARRIED OUT BY EXTENSION SERVICE

We believe that the local community mobilization can be carried out effectively by the Extension Service. We believe this is the most difficult part of the whole job.

The numbers needed are far larger than we yet realize. You cannot find out accurately how many workers are needed and where they will be needed. Under voluntary mobilization there is the further difficulty of knowing if volunteers will be available on the days needed.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS SHOULD BE PROVIDED FOR EXTENSION SERVICE

We think that the amount of funds suggested for local mobilization, about $6,000,000, is not enough. The amount in the bill will provide for approximately 2,400 new employees. So there can be one full-time person in each of several hundred counties, and a person just for the summer in about 2,000 counties. We think Extension Services ought to have more funds, because this part of the program is going to be the most difficult.

PROBLEM OF RECRUITMENT OF PERMANENT YEAR-AROUND FARM WORKERS

The second program, the recruitment of permanent year around workers, is something so new that it is hard to know how far it can go.

Only about 7 or 8 percent of our year-around persons on farms are hired, about 750,000. We have lost a good many of the best workers to the Army or to war plants, but there is not the terrific shortage that some people claim, except in areas very close to industrial centers or in areas where, as I mentioned before, the farm operators are along in years, and the last son has been drafted.

Both situations are critical. Dairy farms around Seattle, or in New England, have an acute situation. In the area west of the Mississippi, the damage done by the draft has been the greatest, because the average age of the operators was the highest, as shown by the census, and farms are mostly family-size.

We think that it is possible to find 40,000 or 50,000 farm families from many places in the country. In almost all States there is a very sizable number of farm families, with extremely low incomes, and for whom wages of $75, $85, and $100 a month would prove a satisfactory incentive to move if they had a way of getting on such a job.

We have been moving some people out of Kentucky to New York farms, something that probably never happened before. Farmers from Kentucky went by the tens of thousands to Akron, to work in the rubber plants, or to Detroit.

It is no argument that many of these poorer farmers do not have dairy cows, and are not familiar with the care and treatment of good dairy cattle. Their general experience on the farm with some kind of livestock fits them for becoming good dairy hands.

Senator HAYDEN. You have given us a very broad general picture here. I would like to know just what you think we ought to do with the bill as it passed the House. I have to leave pretty soon, and I would like to hear you discuss that point.

OBTAINING OF SEASONAL FARM LABORERS

Mr. HANDSCHIN. Lastly, it is possible to find 300,000 to 400,000 mobile workers. We have had that many in the past. Perhaps 100,000 can come in from Mexico, the Bahamas, and Puerto Rico.

Senator NYE. You think you can get 100,000 from that source?

Mr. HANDSCHIN. In the course of time, Senator, we can get the rest in this country because the opportunities now possible to offer hired hands are greater than their opportunities on small farms.

Around 600,000 farm families have extremely low incomes. This figure excludes sharecroppers, farmers working off of the farm more than 100 days a year, and farmers over 65 years of age. That total is figured from farmers having under $250 gross income in the Southern States, under $400 gross income in the New England, Northwestern, and Southwestern States, and under $600 gross income in the good land areas through the Midwest and out to California.

That is a substantial number of people. Some of them have already gone into industry. They are not making, where they are now, any important contribution at all to the war. Many of these people are undoubtedly anxious to make a better living.

In times past, they have moved to the extent that opportunities afforded. For the duration a sizable part of that group, could be attracted by the chance to earn themselves a much better living. They could even get some savings with which to return to their own land in a better position to farm after the war.

IN 1942 ONE-THIRD OF FARMERS PRODUCED LESS THAN 6 PERCENT OF FOOD MARKETED

Last year one-third of our farmers produced less than 6 percent of the amount of farm products which were marketed. That should be adjusted, because they raised some food for their own living, although not enough for a good living.

Another one-third of our farmers only produced 14 percent of the total production, and the top third produced 80 percent, of which the top one-tenth produced 50 percent.

Those figures are a little misleading, because on those larger farms producing most of the production were employed three-quarters of a million year-round workers, and also most of the two or three million seasonal workers, so the amount of labor going into those farms was nearly half of the total labor power, but their production was four-fifths of the total.

There must be a central point in each State or district which will schedule the need for labor much more closely than ever before, and route people to those points of need.

WORK UNDER MIGRATORY LABOR PROGRAM

The committee is familiar with that type of work under the migratory labor program. We never liked that program insofar as it was a subsidy for some types of farming which we oppose. But the program raised the standards for these workers, and thus indirectly helped the farmer who depended on his own and his family's labor.

FIXING OF STANDARDS OF MIGRATORY LABOR

Emphasis should not be put on the standards for the workers. Psychologically it was a mistake.

MINIMUM WAGE STANDARDS

Emphasis has to be put on being able to offer people a definite, attractive opportunity. Otherwise they will not pick up their belongings and move around the country unless the work looks as definite as a factory job.

There must be authority to see to it that the labor is used effectively. The requirement until now, that the worker be guaranteed work 75 percent of the available time, discounting the weather, is too low. We have wasted a lot of labor in past seasons. Labor is the cheapest thing we had. We had the most chaotic labor situation in the country in the migratory labor field. We cannot afford that now. We have to rationalize that labor market and get practically full employment. If this is done, even a 30 cents an hour wage will give these people a much better income than they had before. Therefore, the emphasis should be upon full-time work rather than on wage minimums. Wages in the main will take care of themselves, in a period of scarcity.

FIXING OF HOUSING AND HEALTH STANDARDS

Conditions of housing and health for workers are really of importance to the employing farmers. Just as the opponents of stand-

ards have come around to realize the importance of having migratory labor camps, which they did not like in the beginning, so they will come around eventually to see that it pays to have a worker who has a rainproof shelter to sleep in and maybe even a bed with springs on it, safe running water that is safe, and some medical attention available. Industry has found that it pays.

MOBILIZATION OF VOLUNTARY LAND ARMY

These people should be mobilized into a voluntary land army. They should enlist voluntarily for a definite period, under some minimum guarantee.

Who should handle this migratory program? We feel, while it is excellent to have the local mobilization of labor in the hands of the Extension Service, it would be very unfortunate to have this program under a State authority and not under Federal authority.

HANDLING OF INTERSTATE MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

A problem which is so obviously an interstate problem, some parts of which call for constant movement from State to State, just has to be under a Federal authority. It cannot work with 48 different contracting parties.

We do not see how the Employment Service would be able to fulfill its end of this job. It is overloaded now with work. It is understaffed. It has not been able to do much in the farm picture up to date and what it has done has not been very satisfactory.

EFFECT OF PROVISO REQUIRING CONSENT OF COUNTY AGENT OR STATE AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONER FOR MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

We do not see how you are going to properly insure a flow of labor from one territory to another if any worker in a given county can be prevented from leaving by the refusal of a county agent to give a written statement to the effect that he can leave.

It would be just as intelligent to make the same kind of regulation necessary for the Employment Service in recruiting industrial labor: You shall not take anyone from this town to some other town to work unless you get the written permission of the mayor. We cannot any more hope to organize our farm labor supply that moves between States without Federal authority than we could hope to organize the industrial production program if we gave authority to each storekeeper or factory owner to say how many workers he is going to keep regardless of their wish to go elsewhere.

PROVISION FOR MACHINERY IN STATES TO PROVIDE DEFINITE REVIEW BEFORE WORKERS ARE SENT OUT OR BROUGHT IN

I am sure the Members of the House who supported that provision were alarmed, and I believe they have some cause for alarm. I think the committee would be well advised to place into the bill, in place of the provision to which I refer, a provision for State and local machinery to provide a review of the situation before workers are brought

in or taken out of that State or county. This should be set up so advice could be given by farmers and appeals brought.

Senator McCarran. What action have you in mind? Would it be removal of the workers?

Mr. Handschin. The enlistment of workers or the problem of how many workers are needed to be brought into the county.

Senator Nye. Who would you put that problem up to?

CREATION OF FARM LABOR COMMITTEES

Mr. Handschin. There ought to be a farm labor committee.

Senator Nye. For each State?

Mr. Handschin. For each State and county, to perform the functions of being an advisory committee and an appeals committee.

Senator Nye. Why couldn't the war boards in the county do that?

Mr. Handschin. I think they could. We have not made a specific suggestion. The war boards are immediately responsible for production.

Senator Nye. That is right.

NEED FOR FEDERAL CONTROL

Mr. Handschin. We cannot have a situation where local people, without knowledge of the situation throughout their State and throughout the Nation, can veto any action as they may see fit.

Our organization thinks that it is absolutely essential to have undisputed Federal control, with full opportunity to appeal and advise.

One of the weaknesses of this resolution is that in proposing to give the job to the Extension Service, it provides no right of appeal and no possibility for farmers to advise the Government.

Senator McCarran. The Extension Service is, at least, quasi-Federal authority.

Mr. Handschin. It is quasi-Federal, but in fact, its policies are determined largely within the State.

Senator McCarran. It is finally determined by the Federal Government.

Mr. Handschin. Only in small part. The Secretary of Agriculture has no actual power over the Extension Service other than the right of vetoing nominations for State directors.

Senator McCarran. The Extension Service, if I am not mistaken, has carried out a great deal of the Federal activities with reference to agriculture in the past.

REQUEST FOR TEXT OF CHARGES REQUESTED

[See p. 257]

Senator Hayden. Have you proposed specific language in the bill to carry out these ideas; a change in the text?

Mr. Handschin. Senator, I do not have, but I would be glad to furnish it to the committee.

We urge the striking of the Pace amendment, and substituting for it some kind of machinery whereby local or Federal——

Senator McCarran. That is what I was getting at; what the nature of the substitute or the text was.

Mr. Handschin. I do not have that drafted. I will be glad to attempt to draft it.

SERVICES OF PRIVATE AGENCIES IN MOVING FARM LABORERS

Senator McCarran. You say "before any labor shall be removed." What would you do with private agencies that come in and seek to remove labor from one place to another? It has been testified here that the very best service has been rendered by private agencies in the past; contractors.

Mr. Handschin. There was no public agency involved in this field until very recently. It has become necessary for a Federal agency to intervene because, among other things, of a transportation bottleneck.

It is conceivable that a private agency could help, but if you have competitive private agencies doing it, you will have inefficient use of labor, just under the private agencies in the past you had inefficient use of labor.

We had a great waste of our manpower, simply because we had no central clearinghouse, no labor market, where you could determine readily how many workers were available. If private agencies continue to operate they must gear their plans in with an over-all schedule. Otherwise they might do more harm than good.

AMENDMENTS RECOMMENDED

[See p. 257]

We propose that the funds from this appropriation be turned over to the Secretary of Agriculture; that it be left in his discretion as to the machinery which he will build up under the Agricultural Labor Administration for the transportation of workers, both interstate and intrastate matter. It does not stop at State lines.

We had a telegram this week from Arkansas asking us: Why can't Farm Security transport workers within the State? They won't transport them now unless it is over 200 miles. It is an interstate matter as well. The question is, Whether you have got to get somebody to leave his home for a long time and furnish him transportation, or can you get somebody by some pick-up method in the local community?

Wherever transportation has to be provided, that matter should be in the hands of the Federal Government operating through such agencies as the Secretary may see fit.

LOCAL MOBILIZATION SHOULD BE UNDER EXTENSION SERVICE—NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS

Funds for local mobilization should be increased. The total fund originally requested, $65,000,000, is not excessive. It might be cut down to $50,000,000. We see no reason for not starting with enough money and having to come here again in the height of the harvesting season.

AMOUNT OF BUDGET ESTIMATE

Senator Hayden. The break-down of the estimate provides for the last 6 months of the current fiscal year, $28,201,000; for the first 6 months of the next fiscal year, which would be to the end of the calendar year 1943, $36,873,000.

Mr. HANDSCHIN. That would give an indication, Senator, of about how much might be pared off to fit the shorter period of time. Most of that money is going for transportation and housing. Only about $10,000,000 is going for personnel. There would be approximately the same amount of personnel for the Extension Service as for the Agricultural Labor Administration.

PROVISION FOR VOLUNTARY ENLISTED LAND ARMY

The resolution should provide for a voluntary enlisted land army for a period of 1 year. There should be developed a minimum contract for such enlistment, guaranteeing a certain amount of work and adequate and healthful living conditions.

DELETION OF PROVISO REQUIRING CONSENT OF COUNTY AGENT OR STATE COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE FOR MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

The provision should be stricken, which would freeze labor where it happens to be at the moment, upon the opinion of the county agent or State commissioner of agriculture.

IMPORTANCE OF FARM JOB SIMPLIFICATION

The proposal in the budget for investigation into ways and means of discovering new labor-saving methods on the farm is very important. Industry has done that for 30 or 40 years with great benefits. Agriculture has done very little along that line.

We have shown farmers how to conduct their operations so that they have an even labor load during the year, but we have done very little investigation of labor skills and the management of groups of workers, where you have group work in agriculture.

Senator McCARRAN. That would not enter into a large sum of money.

Mr. HANDSCHIN. Senator, there was some antagonism on the other side, toward allowing any funds. The thought was that the initiative of each of the State colleges would achieve this job.

We believe it should have all the stimulus possible, and a national clearinghouse to get the job done as fast as possible.

Why should we develop something in one State and then perhaps duplicate it in another State? The results will be worth a hundred times whatever amount the Congress puts up. There is a gold mine of possibilities for labor-saving activities that has not yet been realized by farmers any more than it occurred to manufacturers before it was actually demonstrated.

LETTER FROM PROF. JOHN D. BLACK ON AVAILABILITY OF FARM LABOR AND REPORT OF 1943 CROP PRODUCTION BY COUNTY AGENTS

I would like to file for the record, since I think some members may be interested in it, a letter from Prof. John D. Black, of Harvard University, head of the agricultural economics work there. This letter was published, incidentally, before the crop report came out. The title given to the letter by the editors is "Enough Farm Labor Said To Be Available."

I would like to read one or two things out of it. Dr. Black is one of the leading economists, a former Wisconsin dairyman, and very much a man of the soil.

The article reads as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, March 16, 1943]

ENOUGH FARM LABOR SAID TO BE AVAILABLE

HARVARD ECONOMIST BELIEVES THAT SUFFICIENT FOOD CAN BE PRODUCED

To the Editor of the Star:

In Washington for the past 4 days, I have been reading the Star and other Washington papers on the food situation and have become disturbed over the manner in which the food supply question is being discussed in Congress and the press. This is no time for hysteria on the subject. It is highly important that the public be not needlessly frightened about the food supply and equally important that the farmers be not dismayed by misleading reports. We need to know as accurately as is possible what the facts are about the food and farm labor situation, and then talk and act in terms of these facts.

Our understanding of the situation recently was very much confused by the circularizing of the county agents of the country as to the prospects for the 1943 crop. Most of them reported that the 1943 goals would not be attained, some of them indicating a deficiency of 15 to 30 percent. No one holds in higher regard than I do the county agents of the country and the help they are giving to the war effort. In fact, one of the defects of the present organization of agricultural production is that it does not give them a chance to be as helpful as they could be. But reporting crop prospects is one of the few things that county agents do not do well. It has been common knowledge in the Department of Agriculture for many years that county agents make poor crop reporters. Almost invariably they overstate changes. If there has been a shift toward dairying in an area and you ask the county agent about it, he commonly will report twice what has occurred. Conversely, if some disease attacks cattle in his county, he often will report twice the amount of it. This, of course, is because his attention constantly is called to the most pronounced examples of the phenomenon.

I had occasion this winter to ask for reports on the losses in last year's crops from a large number of people in agriculture in which many county agents were included. The county agents' reports exaggerated losses greatly as compared with other reports and as compared with the final official reports on production. Their reports of farm labor shortages were even more exaggerated as judged by the same standards. The only farmers who bother the county agent about farm labor are those who are short of labor. Also these commonly are the larger farmers, who, naturally, have had the most difficulty finding needed labor.

Whether this year's food output will exceed last year's will depend upon the weather more than anything else. So far as planting, breeding, and feeding are concerned, enough will be done, taking all classes and sizes of farms together, to give us more than was produced last year, provided the weather is as good; also provided public and private agencies make enough of the right kind of credit available, and also provided the farmers and public agencies do a reasonably good job of collaborating in utilizing the farm labor that is available now on farms or that can be made available when needed. Congress has a chance right now to help with both of these provisions.

Even if the season is relatively unfavorable, no one in this country need go hungry any more than usual. (Of course, we have many millions of underfed people in this country all the time; but this is not because we cannot produce the needed food.) Some shifts in diet will be necessary, but they will not lower the general level of diiet, and, in fact, easily could be made in such a way as to raise it. Any strong argument for a larger food supply must be based upon the strategy of supplying our allies with more food than at present both while the war is on and immediately afterward. Arguments on this basis are compelling.

There is farm labor enough at hand or within reach to plant, care for, and harvest this year's crop and livestock output, if it is reasonably well mobilized. The dairy areas probably are as short of labor as any, and yet last week I received a letter from a dairy journal editor in the heart of the dairy region which contains the following sentences: "There is no surplus labor on dairy farms. On the other hand, there is enough labor to permit the farm work in this section to

be well done." From the heart of the Corn Belt comes a report of a farm-to-farm canvass of labor needs and available labor in five counties to the effect that, "reshuffling is taking place at a rapid rate. Farmers short on labor are selling cows to their neighbors that have sufficient help to expand and maybe renting them some land, too, * * * Few of the farmers who earlier said they needed year-'round help were still wanting them when we offered them such hands recently."

But we cannot be sure that the labor will be mobilized as it should be. The Department of Agriculture is proceeding falteringly with the development of an efficient organization for this purpose. Congress has not helped much as yet.

JOHN D. BLACK,

Professor of Economics, Harvard University (Member of Food and Nutrition Board, Editor of Nutrition and Food Supply; The War and After.)

Dr. Black carries on a very voluminous communication with many people all over the country, farmers and others, regarding crop conditions and such like.

I thought the committee might be interested, because, in our judgment, that represents a sound and conservative view.

REQUEST FOR TEXT OF AMENDMENTS DESIRED

[See p. 257]

Senator HAYDEN. It will be helpful to the committee. Between now and Thursday, would you study this joint resolution and submit to us the text of any such changes you think ought to be made in it?

Mr. HANDSCHIN. I will be very glad to do it.

Senator HAYDEN. Please submit it to the clerk of the committee.

Mr. HANDSCHIN. I will be very glad to do so.

FARM JOBS SIMPLIFICATION

Senator NYE. My attention is called to the House report, which indicates that the House committee's omission of the project for farm jobs simplification was nothing more than a consideration that that kind of a study could not be completed before the end of the war, and by that time we will not have any occasion for knowing too much.

Mr. HANDSCHIN. Senator, I have personally interested myself in this subject for the past 3 or 4 months and become acquainted with what little has been done. Good results can very often be obtained in an afternoon or day or a week of work by someone who has a little skill in it. Farmers themselves can do much if the means of going about studying the use of their own labor is pointed out to them.

We have evidence that much could be done in a matter of a very few months. Certainly, if the war happens to last longer than 1 year, we will need it greatly.

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Goss, we will now hear from you.

STATEMENT OF ALBERT S. GOSS, MASTER OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

SERIOUSNESS OF FARM LABOR PROBLEM

Mr. Goss. If the committee please, the National Grange believes that the problem of farm labor is one of the most serious problems confronting our Nation. Until some fundamental changes in our

labor laws are enacted, the problem will not be fully solved, and it will be impossible to attain maximum food production. Our problem is to do the best we can in the the situation we face.

NO RECOMMENDATION AS TO AMOUNT TO BE APPROPRIATED

House Joint Resolution 96 appropriates $26,100,000 for the purpose of recruiting farm labor. There is need for much to be done, but since there is little experience upon which to form judgment, we do not know whether or not this amount is adequate, so have no recommendations for any change in the sum provided. We do have some amendments to suggest in the method provided for administration.

RESPONSIBILITY OF FARM LABOR PLACEMENT SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN GIVEN TO FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Sometime ago the War Manpower Commission delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture the responsibility of administering the law and regulations dealing with farm labor placement. The Secretary placed the responsibility upon the Farm Security Administration. In our judgment that Agency has failed to secure results commensurate with the time and money expended.

INADEQUACY OF LABOR SUPPLY FROM MEXICO

As an example, in dealing with the Mexican labor situation, what has heretofore been a source of an adequate supply of farm labor has turned out to be a source of a very small supply of wholly inexperienced labor largely recruited from nonfarmers from Mexico City, while the usual supplies of capable men are reported to be available near the border waiting for work. Months have gone by and nothing practical has been done about it. Based on the record of accomplishment, we believe the Secretary should have placed this heavy responsibility elsewhere.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96 PLACES RESPONSIBILITY ON EXTENSION SERVICE

This measure would take the responsibility away from the Secretary and place it on the Extension Service. Such an arrangement, we believe, is administratively unworkable.

RESPONSIBILITY SHOULD BE PLACED IN SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

We believe the responsibility rests solely with the Secretary of Agriculture. He has at his command every agency of the Department of Agriculture, including the Extension Service. Although the Extension Service is primarily an educational institution and should ordinarily confine its work to educational fields and avoid administrative responsibilities, we believe its field organization is best equipped to handle the present emergency measure. We are glad to report that the Secretary of Agriculture has given us his assurance that it is his intention to place the responsibility upon that organiza-

tion without duplication of effort in the field. We believe that the Extension Service can handle the intrastate work with less extra help than would be required to operate through any other agency, but authority should be given to call on the U. S. Employment Service or any other agency, through the Secretary, if additional help is needed.

IMPORTATION OF FARM LABOR SHOULD BE HANDLED BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

The problem of handling the importation of foreign labor and the problem of migratory labor involve contacts with foreign governments, with different governmental departments, and with State governments. We believe these contacts should be made by the Secretary of Agriculture or his direct representative. Construction and operation of migratory labor camps are also involved.

EXTENSION SERVICE NOT EQUIPPED TO HANDLE MANY OF PROBLEMS INVOLVED

In the judgment of the Secretary and the Federal Director of Extension, the Extension Service is not equipped to handle many of these problems with maximum speed and effectiveness, and we have seen no evidence to warrant questioning their judgment in the matter. On the contrary, we believe that the maximum efficiency can be attained if the Secretary is allowed a free hand to use any or all of the agencies at his command as circumstances warrant. We believe he should not be relieved of this responsibility. Not only should all facilities of his Department be at his disposal, but he should have the power as well, if in his judgment it is deemed necessary, to call on the U. S. Employment Service, or any other agency of Government available to get this necessary work done.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96 PLACES RESPONSIBILITY ON A SUBORDINATE OF THE SECRETARY

This bill places the responsibility on a subordinate of the Secretary. We cannot agree with this line of responsibility. The responsibility is taken out of the hands of the Secretary and placed in the hands of one of his subordinates who must carry out the policies of the Secretary. In fact, the bill implies the renegotiation of an agreement with Mexico. It seems altogether unlikely that the Mexican Government would give greater consideration to an employee of the Secretary than to the Secretary himself, and certainly the Director of Extension is not expected to direct the Secretary as to the negotiation of such treaty. The arrangement seems utterly impractical in this respect.

If the committee feels that the Secretary has not placed capable men at the head of the labor division, it should make its purpose plain by providing that the Secretary shall employ executives experienced in the problem of labor placement whose major responsibility should be to secure a maximum supply of experienced farm labor. Senatorial approval could be required if deemed necessary.

BILL SHOULD BE AMENDED TO PLACE RESPONSIBILITY ON SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

We therefore suggest that the bill be amended to place on the Secretary the responsibility for interstate and foreign operation.

EFFECT OF HOUSE PROVISO REQUIRING CONSENT OF COUNTY AGENT OR STATE COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE FOR TRANSPORTATION OF FARM LABORERS

In lines 8 to 16 on page 4, it is provided that no worker may be transported across county lines without the consent of the county agent from the originating county, or across State lines without the consent of the State commissioner of agriculture. This would have the possibility of preventing any movement of migratory or seasonal labor if some official who had more interest in local conditions than in the national welfare decided to withhold his approval. His will would be supreme although it might be inimical to the best interests of the Nation in meeting the war emergency. We believe this provision should be deleted, or if it is thought best to retain this provision, we believe that some sort of a board of review, made up of farmers, should be set up for making appeals from decisions of that kind.

MIGRATORY LABOR CAMPS SHOULD BE LEFT UNDER DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

We note that the migratory labor camps are to be put under the Extension Service. The Federal Director of Extension and a number of State directors have informed us that they were not equipped to handle them and did not want them. We do not like to see the work of the Extension men thus diverted from war production where they are so badly needed. This responsibility should be left with the Secretary. In many instances the Farm Security has done a very commendable job in maintaining these camps. Where the work is well done, we see no reason for transferring it to others. Where it has not been well done the Secretary should be able to call on the United States Employment Service, the Extension Service, or any other agency he found best fitted for the task.

INTERSTATE ACTIVITIES PLACED UNDER UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

The interstate activities are placed under the United States Employment Service. There seems to be a rather clear line of demarcation as to the activities between the Extension Service and the United States Employment Service, the former handling the intrastate placements and the latter the interstate movements. The chairman of the New York Manpower Commission presented information to us indicating need for greater service in intrastate placements than the Extension Service would be able to handle without more than doubling its force. The United States Employment Service is manned and equipped to render such service in the larger cities, and we believe

it should be possible to make use of this service. On the other hand, full dependence should not be placed on the United States Employment Service alone.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE BARRED FROM RECRUITING LABOR IN AREA WHERE A STRIKE IS CALLED

For example, we understand that if a strike is called in any locality, the United States Employment Service is automatically barred from recruiting labor for that area until the strike is settled. In the case of perishable crops, this would mean that recruitment service would cease if some group, possibly very few in number, should call a strike. In such circumstances, we believe the Secretary should have power to make use of any agencies available to him to carry on the work.

Senator RUSSELL. What law imposes any such restriction as that?

Mr. GOSS. I think that is the regulation, Senator.

Senator RUSSELL. Of the Labor Department?

Mr. GOSS. Of the Labor Department; yes.

Senator RUSSELL. That is, if a strike is called in any community?

Mr. GOSS. It is either in a community, as I understand it, or in industry; the thought being that they will not serve as recruiting strikebreakers.

Senator RUSSELL. The way you stated it, it will go a good deal further. If two men happen to be engaged in a kindred industry and there is a strike against one of them, his employees might be perfectly satisfied, but they could not furnish him with any help.

Mr. GOSS. We believe there is great danger in that thing for agriculture.

Senator RUSSELL. I am frank to say I do not approve the way this bill is drawn, because I think it is utterly unworkable in the shape it comes to us now. I think we might just as well throw $26,000,000 out of the window.

Mr. GOSS. I thought I should call this strike situation to the committee's attention.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes.

PROVISO FAVORED PRESERVING EXEMPTIONS FOR FARM LABOR FOUND IN FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT AND NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. GOSS. We are in sympathy with the proviso on page 5, lines 13 to 24, relating to preserving the exemptions for farm labor found in the Fair Labor Standards Act and the National Labor Relations Act in regard to domestic labor.

SAFEGUARD SHOULD BE PROVIDED IN CONNECTION WITH IMPORTED LABOR

However, we believe a safeguard should be provided in connection with bringing in foreign labor. At present, the agreement with Mexico requires certain guaranties which do not recognize the exemptions of these acts. There is no assurance that the agreement can be changed. As the bill now stands this would mean that there would be no more Mexican labor available. We believe this should be properly safeguarded by amendment which should recognize the existence

of these agreements and the necessity of operating under them as long as they exist.

CAREFUL STUDY SHOULD BE GIVEN TO PENDING MEASURE

We appreciate the need for prompt action, but sufficient time should be taken to make sure that the most effective agencies are used for meeting this difficult problem. We suggest that the committee call before it the heads of the manpower commissions of one or two States which have been dealing with this problem before determining on the policy of giving the Secretary of Agriculture broad powers to do the job, or definitely assigning the work to the Extension Service. Summing up, we believe Congress should be explicit in setting forth what is to be done, but should leave the administrative responsibility to the proper official to carry out, without tying his hands as to details. Greatest efficiency can be attained by keeping the legislative and administrative functions of the Government separate.

Senator NYE. I think that is a very concise presentation.

Senator RUSSELL. It is very clear.

Senator NYE. We have not even had to ask for recommendations here which we do frequently of the witnesses.

Mr. GOSS. We did not draw the amendments. We have just pointed out what we thought should be done but we did not attempt to draw the amendments.

Senator RUSSELL. I believe you said you are not in a position to make the suggestions that you think should be incorporated.

Mr. GOSS. We feel we do not know enough about it to suggest the amount of money required. We do feel there should be ample funds, but it is a new field, and we do not feel competent to say whether it is too much or too little.

Senator NYE. So far as bringing in foreign labor is concerned, we have had some experience with Mexican labor.

Mr. GOSS. We think the responsibility properly belongs on the Secretary for making those contacts. We are not satisfied with what has been done, Senator, not at all. Very frankly, we have talked it over with him fully. We have talked over the men he selected, and we have not been satisfied entirely with them. But he has given us assurance that if he cannot get results, he will be prompt in making a change, and we think that he is determined to get results. We do not know where you can put the responsibility more properly.

Senator RUSSELL. I am sure the subcommittee thanks you for the interest you have shown in this matter. If there is nothing further, the subcommittee will adjourn.

(Whereupon at 5:30 p. m. the meeting adjourned.)

FARM LABOR PROGRAM, 1943

THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1943

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met in the committee room, the Capitol, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:30 a. m., Hon. Richard B. Russell presiding.

Present: Senators Russell, Hayden, Tydings, Thomas of Oklahoma, McCarran, O'Mahoney, Bankhead, Nye, Holman, and Brooks.

Present also: Senator Downey.

Senator RUSSELL. The committee will come to order. We will be glad to hear you, Mr. Teague.

STATEMENTS OF CHARLES C. TEAGUE, PRESIDENT OF THE CALIFORNIA FRUIT GROWERS' EXCHANGE, PRESIDENT OF THE CALIFORNIA WALNUT GROWERS' ASSOCIATION, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES, REPRESENTING THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND IVAN McDANIEL

BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE OF WITNESS

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: Perhaps, I might just say a word in the way of a personal introduction, as I do not know many of you, simply as an indication of my qualifications to testify at this hearing.

I have been a producer in agriculture for 50 years. I began as a worker on the farm at $1.50 a day and everything that I possess I have made out of agricultural production.

I am not one of these farmers farming the farmers. I have been operating agricultural-producing lands and am now in citrus fruits, walnuts, almonds, grains, alfalfa, beans, and various other products.

Senator RUSSELL. You seem to be qualified from the standpoint of agriculture.

Mr. TEAGUE. I know something about agricultural problems.

Senator THOMAS. You were a member of the first Farm Board, were you not?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes; I was.

Senator THOMAS. That was at the beginning of the present agricultural program?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

May I say to you further than I am president of the California Fruit Growers' Exchange and I have been in that capacity for 22

years; I have also been president of the California Walnut Growers' Association for 30 years. Both of these organizations are cooperative. The exchange shippers control 75 percent of the citrus production in California that is shipped through the exchange, and the Walnut Growers' Association 85 percent.

I claim to represent the family-sized farmer, although I am not a family-sized farmer myself, as indicated by the fact that we have in the exchange some 16,000 members, and the average size of the farms or orchards in that organization is just about 15 acres.

In the Walnut Association we have six or seven thousand members, and the average size of the farm in that organization is 9 acres.

So I claim to represent not only the family-sized farmer, but also the larger farmers, and the middle-sized farmers that belong to that organization.

IMPORTANCE OF FAMILY-SIZED FARMS

There is a lot of misinformation spread with respect to family-sized farmers.

Now, the family-sized farms form the backbone, in my opinion, of the agricultural producers of this country and they are not subsistence farmers, as a class. They are men who can make a living at farming, if anybody can, because they do most of the work themselves, if they are situated on land that can produce. Now, on the other hand there are a lot of farms which are submarginal or marginal, where the farmers have a great deal of difficulty in making a living. We have every sympathy for that sort of a producer and we think that we should give him every assistance that we can; but to think of turning over—incidentally, I might say I am also president of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and we have members in that organization.

Senator McCarran. May I ask you a question?

Mr. Teague. Pardon me, but may I just say this? I do not want to interrupt you, but if I could be allowed to proceed with an orderly presentation and continuity of thought here, in making my presentation to you, if you will be kind enough to do so.

Senator Russell. It is entirely up to you. If you prefer not to be interrupted, we will not interrupt you.

Mr. Teague. Then, I will be glad to answer any questions I can. On the other hand, if you insist I will be glad to answer questions as I go along, but I would much prefer to make an orderly presentation. I think it will save your time and will save mine, and yours is the important thing. I have got plenty of time. But, if I can do that I think it will save time, because the questions which you ask me I may a little later reach in my presentation. That is the only reason I am making that suggestion, gentlemen.

Senator McCarran. That is prefectly all right with me.

Senator Russell. If you prefer, you may proceed without interruption.

Mr. Teague. I would prefer it that way.

Senator Russell. All right, sir.

Mr. Teague. If you do not object.

Senator Russell. Not at all.

ACUTENESS OF FARM LABOR PROBLEM IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. TEAGUE. All right. Now, I am appearing here today principally as the representative of the Governor of California, because of the very acute situation that perhaps is not present in many of the producing States of the Nation, as it is in California, because of our large production of specialty crops and the large amount of labor that goes into those crops and the fact that we are right up against now the harvesting of some of these crops, and the question of planting and of labor that is going to insure a farmer that he is going to have labor for agriculture and harvest and that is extremely important if we are going to anything like reach our production goals.

LETTERS TO CHARLES C. TEAGUE FROM GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA

Now, just to show, if I may present this statement, I received this letter from Hon. Earl Warren, Governor of California.

Incidentally, I will say to you that I did not see him during his campaign, and I have not seen him since he was elected. If I may read this letter [reading]:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Sacramento, March 13, 1943.

Mr. C. C. TEAGUE,
Santa Paula, Calif.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I will appreciate it if you will undertake the assignment mentioned in the enclosed letter. This is written after consultation with representatives of the farming interests, who believe, as I do, that if anyone can work out this problem you can.

Sincerely,

EARL WARREN, *Governor.*

I have also received from Governor Warren the following letter. [Reading:]

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Sacramento, March 13, 1943.

Mr. C. C. TEAGUE,
Santa Paula, Calif.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: California's importance as a major food-producing State necessitates full cooperation between Federal and State agencies to enable us to meet our food-production quotas. This cooperation can best be effected by personal representation in Washington. Therefore, I hereby authorize you as my personal representative to contact Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, War Manpower Commissioner McNutt, and such other Federal agencies as may be necessary for immediate relief of the California farm-manpower shortage.

As Governor, I am gravely concerned over the labor shortage and the fear of labor shortages that are primarily responsible for the lag in food production that has developed and is developing further. I am fully convinced that our farm-manpower problem is so critical that unless immediate action is taken for the importation of Mexican farm labor, California will drop further behind in the effort to approach its production goal.

On our own front, we are moving ahead through our State and community agencies to mobilize our local farm-labor forces, and I hope that you will be able to come to an understanding with the Federal agencies which will result in the importation of a substantial amount of Mexican farm labor to break the bottleneck in our farm production.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EARL WARREN, *Governor.*

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOWNEY RELATIVE TO FARM LABOR SHORTAGE IN CALIFORNIA

Now, I would like to state at this time, and perhaps I would ask Senator Downey if he will put in the record the statement that he made on November 30, as chairman of the special committee of the United States Senate created for the purpose of investigating farm labor conditions in the West. He said at that time [reading]:

I might preliminarily say for the benefit of the press that the investigation so far has revealed such a serious and critical lack of farm labor in the State of California that only the most energetic and wise and prudent means will save our farmers and the State, and every institution in it, from a very, very serious disaster.

The facts seem to indicate that we have permanent workers on the farms of California to the number of 200,000. I am dealing in very rough figures now. Those are the foremen and the irrigators and the pruners and the well-trained farm workers of California who have been permanently employed on the farms. As I say, those number about 200,000. Apparently that number is now approximately cut in half and we only have the one-half of that number. In addition to that, there is a great shortage of the migratory workers. How much that shortage is in terms of numbers we don't know yet, but we must be short at least 25,000 or 30,000 men right now that are needed in the sugar-beet and cotton fields, and for other purposes.

Now, the fall plowing is not proceeding. Much pruning is not being done. Irrigation ditches are becoming fouled, weeds are growing up, and many farmers right now have abandoned any intention of going ahead next year.

There have been serious losses in some crops due to the lack of farm labor. Wages to farm workers have risen this year to as high as $1.50 an hour, and even up to $15 and $20 a day. Of course, I am citing the extremes. At the same time, the efficiency of farm labor, due to unhappy conditions, has been materially cut.

Now, Senator, if you would introduce into the record for me, please, your copy of your hearings, in which you made this statement, I would appreciate it.

Senator DOWNEY. I will be very happy to put it in.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes. You have the right to offer it for the record.

Mr. TEAGUE. I will offer it then, and you will furnish me with a copy, Senator?

Senator DOWNEY. Yes.

Senator NYE. This is a statement as of last November?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Senator BANKHEAD. Is the situation worse or better now?

Mr. TEAGUE. It is progressively worse, and that is another thing I touch on in a moment.

Senator BANKHEAD. I did not hear all of your statement.

Mr. TEAGUE. Before you came in I asked the privilege, Senator Bankhead, of proceeding with my statement so that I could keep my continuity of thought and then if there are any questions you desire to ask, I will be pleased to attempt to answer them. I may not be able to answer them.

LOSS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS IN CALIFORNIA DUE TO LACK OF LABOR

Director of California Agriculture Cecil has recently issued a statement that even last year there was a loss of $25,000,000 in agricultural products in California, because of an acute labor shortage at that time.

VOLUME OF CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

Now, I think it would not be amiss if I would put in here a statement as to the importance of California agricultural production in the essential food program of this National. These are figures that I think many of you may not be familiar with.

In 1940, California produced 46 percent of the fresh fruit, vegetables, and nuts shipped in United States commerce.

Senator BANKHEAD. What percentage was that?

Mr. TEAGUE. Forty-six percent; 22 percent of the national total vegetables; 23 percent of the sugar beets.

California paid out one-seventh of the total amount of money that was paid out in the United States for agricultural labor.

Those figures are taken from the United States Department of Agriculture reports.

FARM LABOR CONDITIONS GETTING WORSE

Now, Senator, as to the question you asked me, these conditions are getting progressively worse. I operate some properties that right today I cannot get half the labor needed. Citrus fruits represent an important item in the diet of soldiers and there is a demand for them in excess, particularly in the concentrated form, of what we can supply.

On those properties of mine, some of them I cannot get half the labor that I need for harvesting, and we are short in every line of our agricultural operations and men to do the job.

Now, we are up to planting time there. We haven't got snow on the ground as you had here the other day and we are in the harvest of our citrus crop. We have not reached the peak and we will not for 2 months yet.

Asparagus cutting is on, which is a very important item in labor.

A number of minor vegetables are on, but the great peak of agricultural labor demands will just increase progressively for the next 6 or 7 months.

LIMITATIONS IN USE OF SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY LABOR

We are told to use community and school labor. Well, we have been doing that we did it last year, and we have been preparing to organize it more effectively and more efficiently but now they have taken the 18-year-old boys away and this work just cannot be done by women and children. Much of it is too laborious. Much of it is knee and stoop labor in many of these vegetable crops and these big crops, and things of that character.

SPECIAL SESSION OF CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE CALLED

The Governor of California was so seriously concerned with this question that he has called a special session of the Legislature of California to set up some kind of a State labor authority for the distribution of the labor within the State, because he felt, and many others felt, that many of the agencies that were dealing with this thing were break-

ing down and were not performing the job, and if we had to we wanted to go as far as we could with the State organization.

As I say this situation of agricultural labor shortage has gotten progressively worse and the producers are frantic.

IMPORTANCE OF IMPORTATION OF FARM LABOR FROM MEXICO

About a year ago, recognizing this condition, the Secretary of Agriculture negotiated a master contract with Mexico through assistance or by the State Department.

There exists in Mexico an abundant supply of agricultural labor that could be brought to this country with great benefit to them and to this country. I am firmly of the opinion that the greatest contribution that Mexico can make to winning this war is to see that it does add to our labor supply all of the labor that it can add without disrupting their domestic economy, and I think the right sort of representation to Mexico will bring that about.

POSITION RELATIVE TO MASTER CONTRACT NEGOTIATED WITH MEXICO

A master contract was negotiated with Mexico by the Secretary. We in California can operate under the terms of this contract, although we are not entirely satisfied with its terms. I am informed the same thing is true of operators in other western States such as Arizona, Nevada, and Wyoming. The terms and conditions imposed by F. S. A. beyond those required by the master contract were entirely unsatisfactory and unworkable.

We could proceed under the master contract if it were effectuated; if it were properly implemented.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Have you received any labor under it?

Senator RUSSELL. I might say, Senator O'Mahoney, before you came Mr. Teague asked to be permitted to complete his statement before being asked any questions.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Then I beg your pardon.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is perfectly all right. I do not want to seem to be asking for something that is improper.

Senator RUSSELL. That is perfectly all right; it is perfectly all right and I have already told you that it is strictly up to you if you prefer to proceed in that manner, in connection with your remarks. Go right ahead.

Mr. TEAGUE. Thank you.

WRONG AGENCY APPOINTED TO HANDLE WORK

Now, unfortunately the Secretary appointed the wrong agency, in my judgment, to implement this contract; this agency was the Farm Security Administration, which no doubt was well set up originally for a perfectly laudable purpose, which was to try to be of assistance, as I understand it, to the submarginal farmers; the subsistence farmers; and I have no quarrel with that at all; but as I have stated before, the average farmer in this country; the average family-sized farmer, if you will, does not want to become a serf of the Government. He does not need to be. He can operate without it. He does not need subsidies of the Government. All that he needs is labor and machin-

ery, and tools, and a reasonable price incentive, and if he has that, the production will flow in abundance, if we do not put too many things in the way.

NUMBER OF MEXICAN FARM LABORERS IMPORTED FROM MEXICO

In the year since this contract has been negotiated about 6,000 Mexican nationals have been actually brought into this country. Recently, they have been a little more active in recruiting some Mexicans that are now en route; but that is the result of a year's operation.

Now, the magnitude of this job is such that it is a real task requiring the right sort of ability, which I will touch on a moment later.

EXTENT OF NEED IN CALIFORNIA FOR MEXICAN LABOR

In California, alone, we need 50,000 of these Mexicans coming in during the next 6 or 7 months. They should be coming in at the rate of eight to ten thousand per month.

This requires bringing into California as many people as came to California during the gold rush.

That is no job for amateurs. It requires the right sort of an agency for recruitment, transportation, and housing; and it just cannot be done in my judgment by social workers, no matter how good their intentions may be; it just cannot be done by that sort of an organization.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACT WITH FARM GROWERS UNSATISFACTORY

As indicating this, the first move that they made was the adoption of a contract between the Farm Security Administration and the producers which was impracticable; which was very irritating in all of the contacts with growers, and these people have just been continually obstructive in doing this very greatly needed job.

TYPE OF MEN REQUIRED TO HANDLE IMPORTATION OF FARM LABOR

What is required in a job of this kind is men of broad administrative experience; men who are familiar with the conditions of doing business in Mexico; who know the Mexican people; who speak the Spanish language, and I do not know how many of you gentlemen know about doing business in Mexico, but the conditions are entirely different than they are in other countries, and you have got to know how to do business in Mexico. You have got to know how to go about it.

Now, men of this character are available; men who are competent to set up the machinery to do this job, and have this labor rolling in here that would take care of this situation.

PROGRAM CANNOT BE HANDLED BY FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

I am confident myself—and we have been patient—we have hoped that something would come of it—but I am confident that the Farm Security Administration just cannot do the job. They do not have the men. They do not have the training or they haven't the ability to do a job of this kind.

PREPARATION OF PLAN FOR HANDLING FARM LABOR PROBLEM

Now, our people recognize that out there and when this responsibility was placed on me of contacting the Federal Government I recognized that we must have a plan. We just could not come over here and complain without we had a plan. So I sent for a man that I knew had wide experience in Mexico—was born there—had operated large properties in Mexico; a man by the name of Thomas Robertson, who lives in the same county I live in. I do not know what his politics are. I am not interested in politics. I do not care what his politics are.

I said to him, "Would you undertake this job of organizing a real recruitment, transportation, and housing project, to take care of this great and pressing need?" "Well," he said to me, "I am operating considerable good-sized properties"—as he is—and he said to me, "I am not seeking this, but I recognize its great importance. I retired from that sort of thing a while ago but I will undertake it if I am asked to do it." "Well," I said, "Could you locate some men who could be coadministrators of a plan of this sort, who have the same sort of experience that you have?" And he said, "Yes." He then said, "I have some personal friends, two of them; one operated the biggest sugar interest in Mexico where he received a salary of around $25,000 a year"—which is quite a lot in Mexico. And this man finally retired, but he is in good physical condition and good health and he would like to help out, and he said, "I am willing to be one that would help you." And he had another man who was not born in Mexico, but spent many years in Mexico; farmed large properties down there, and was engaged in packing and shipping products from down there, and he said that he was sure he could be prevailed upon to help him out.

"All right," I said to him, "Now, Tom, if you will undertake that, I want you to go over and I will try to present and get accepted in Washington a real administrative plan for doing this job." I said, "I want you to get these fellows together and make up a budget of what this job will cost of moving in a minimum of 8,000 men a month. I want you to determine the areas that you would want to recruit from and the cost of every phase of the operation, including transportation, feeding, and all of those problems incident to moving 10,000 men a month."

He came back to me with a complete plan, itemized, and the coadministrators with him were willing to work for $400 a month, which seems to me was pretty reasonable for men of that character, of high executive ability, who are all capable of earning many times that.

So I said to him, "You prepare this complete budget, and I am going to Washington as the Governor's representative, and I shall attempt to get such a plan adopted."

PROGRAM HANDLED UNSATISFACTORILY BY FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Now, I just want to say a word here of the difficulties we have had with the Farm Security Administration in doing this job. In the first place they have not got any results; whether it be from lack of capacity or lack of intention to do the job, I am not going to say which it is; but it is certainly one or the other, because they have not done it.

UNSATISFACTORY CHARACTER OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACT WITH FRUIT GROWERS

This contract that they presented for the growers to sign was just an impossible one; but some of them were forced to sign it—did it under protest—because it was not provided in the master contract, a lot of these conditions; but a lot of conditions have been forced by these fellows who are administering this thing, on producers that were not in either of the contracts—the sort of ruling they made, and the obstructive tactics they have——

Senator TYDINGS. Your position is that they are putting restrictions and conditions in the contract that nobody else had asked for that they themselves want?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is right, exactly.

Senator HAYDEN. He asked for permision to proceed without being interrupted until he had concluded his statement.

Senator TYDINGS. All right.

Senator HAYDEN. Go ahead.

RECRUITING OF FARM LABOR IN MEXICO CITY

Mr. TEAGUE. Now, they went to Mexico City to start their recruiting. Now, it is like our going to New York City to recruit the agricultural labor supply of the United States. It was the wrong area. It was the wrong place to go.

LABOR DIFFICULTIES

We had not had these fellows here but a little while until the fellows who employed them were confronted with strikes and slowdowns. These workers who came in, many of them, had been earning practically nothing before, and now they were in position of earning many times the amount which they had earned in Mexico. In a week, they were earning more than they did in Mexico in a month or more, but we began to have these troubles. I might just mention a few.

At the Lefingwell ranch, in Orange County; San Diego County; Santa Barbara; Ventura County; the Murphy ranch—they got some of these men. Mr. Spencer, of the Murphy ranch, told me this story, that the F. S. A. representatives who came in with the workers told them that they were to be paid 15 cents a box for picking lemons, and that they could pick a hundred boxes a day. You can see what that would mean—$15 a day income. Of course, that is not true. Mr. Spencer told the workers that they could probably pick at the beginning around 20 boxes a day and their earning would come up as their skill was acquired in picking until they could pick perhaps 30 or 35 boxes a day and some maybe 40 after they had learned a little about this.

When the workers finally learned what the actual facts were they went to work and have been happy ever since. The original unsettled conditions could have been entirely avoided if the F. S. A. recruiters had just told the workers the truth in the first place.

But, those are just illustrations.

84461—43——11

Now, I heard Mr. Hughes, the head of F. S. A. in California, make the statement that these workers in the sugar beets, although they were earning much more than the contract provided, and were earning equal to the going rate of wage in those localities, were very much dissatisfied and that they were not willing to work any more on a piece basis.

Anybody who knows anything about the sugar-beet business knows that it is entirely infeasible to harvest sugar beets on an hourly wage basis. Your costs will be just so high, because of the fact that the workers will just not work at the job, and you just could not get any results.

Now, the investigation, the investigation of all of these instances that I speak of, of the slowdowns and strikes and stoppages, showed that the complaints were from people who came in here, who had to be supplied with blankets when they came, to keep them warm, and who were just earning tremendous wages as compared to anything that they had ever earned before; but the investigations of the Manpower Committee that was selected to determine the wage, the average wage level of the community, because the contract provided that you should pay these men, keep them on an equality as to payment for similar classes of work and what you were paying your domestic labor, and all of the hearings that were held, determined that these wages were as good or better than the prevailing rates of wages.

I am just giving those illustrations to just show the conditions that we have been up against.

EXTENSION SERVICE SHOULD DISTRIBUTE BOTH IMPORTED AND INTERSTATE FARM LABOR

In my opinion, the proper function of a labor supply agency divides its duties naturally into two classes:

First, the State function. I think it is a proper function of the State to distribute all labor that is brought into the State, whether it be foreign labor or whether it be labor from other States. I think the Extension Service is equipped to perform that sort of a function. I think it could recruit community labor, and it is an organization that has worked with farmers and has their confidence and it could easily be expanded to do that kind of a job.

SCHOOL LABOR SHOULD BE RECRUITED AND TRAINED BY STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

In my opinion, because you have got to have someone who knows how to handle youngsters, school labor should be recruited and trained by the Departments of Education of the States.

ESTABLISHMENT IN STATES OF A STATE COORDINATOR

I think the States should set up a coordinator so that you would see that these two distributing agencies within the State operated in harmony, because the final agency of distribution is going to be, or should be, in my opinion, because of the demonstrated incapacity of this other group, should be done by the Extension Service. I think there should be set up in the States advisory boards of farmers who

know farm problems, who can help the agencies of distribution within the States, and can advise the Federal Government with respect to its functions.

PROPER FUNCTION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Now, I think the proper function of the Federal Government is that of recruitment, transporting and housing of foreign labor, and the moving of surplus labor from one State to another. Those are interstate problems and they are problems that have to be negotiated by the Federal Government. Your contracts or treaties, or whatever you call them, have to be negotiated with foreign countries and that must be done by a Federal agency.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AREAS OF DISTRIBUTION

There should be set up in reasonable areas of distribution, agencies to where the great needs are, what we might call reception or terminal camps.

Now, I make this suggestion not for the benefit of large companies or corporations. They have their own camps. The large producers have their own camps. The recruit labor can be moved right into their camps from the point of arrival; but the small grower cannot do that. He cannot order the number that he needs. He has to have some place where he can go to get a supply that is in reasonable proximity to the place of operation.

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96 RECOMMENDED

Now, I want to just briefly refer to this House Joint Resolution 96 which you are considering. Our main interest in that bill is first, I think the present bill has certainly got to be amended by striking out some of the provisions and clarifying some others.

PROVISO ON CONSENT FOR MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

I think the limitations are altogether too restrictive for the movement of labor from one State to another. There is a provision in there that provides before you can move labor out of a county, the county agent has got to approve. What county agent is going to take the responsibility of releasing labor even if there is a great surplus of it, when he knows that later in the season it may be needed? That is a restrictive measure that certainly ought to be struck out.

EFFECT OF PROVISION ON IMPORTATION OF LABOR FROM MEXICO

There is another provision that would legislate out of existence the present master contract and it would fall in a period of 30 days, and we would have nothing to take its place if say, we did set up the new recruitment agency down there and started it to work, and this bill became a law. We would have to immediately cease operations, unless there could be some special order by the President with special funds appropriated or set aside for that purpose. You would just have to stop, you see. You could not carry on.

Well, now that obviously is wrong. The present contract with Mexico which some of us thing that we can work under, until a better one is negotiated, certainly should not be legislated out of existence before we have something as good or better to take its place. That is just common sense.

The bill as originally presented would do this. It would just legislate it out of existence.

AMENDMENTS NECESSARY

[See p. 172]

Now, we have been conferring on this. We have been conferring with the representatives of the other farm organizations here in trying to get on the basis of uniform approach to this question and in complete agreement. We had considerable difficulty in finally, I think, arriving at what I hope is an agreement on the amendments that would be satisfactory to us. We have not finally received the complete okay of my friend Mr. O'Neal, who feels that he must consult others before he can definitely promise that he is in agreement with us on these amendments.

Now, if these amendments can be added I believe that the bill should be passed as amended, and I believe that it would set up a sound and more practicable plan of recruiting, transporting, housing, and distribution of agricultural labor, and I very much hope that these gentlemen will be in agreement with us before we get through. In the meantime, I am withholding the presentation of this plan that I am here prepared to present, with complete formula, with complete estimates of cost, because I do not want to do anything that would militate against the passage of this act, which I think would be a great improvement over what we have, but as soon as well that we have, I am going to present this to the authorities who will have the administration of the Federal program. I am going to do everything within my power to get them to adopt it.

I think, gentlemen, that is about all I have to say. I have taken a lot of your time.

Senator RUSSELL. In the last analysis, this committee is going to have to write a bill, if we have one, and some of us are somewhat confused by the provisions of this bill as it came to us from the House, as to whether it is at all workable and practicable. When do you think that you will be willing to let the committee have the benefit of your thoughts on this?

Mr. TEAGUE. Now, we are prepared to present the amendments that we think would be satisfactory which the others have tentatively agreed to.

Senator RUSSELL. Would you object to letting the committee have them as your copy?

Mr. TEAGUE. No, Mr. McDaniel is here, who has been working in cooperation with the Farm Bureau Federation in trying to work out something that would be satisfactory to us and to them, and I am going to ask him, with your permission, to have Mr. McDaniel present those amendments to you; and to explain any other provisions of the contract which he has been studying and been considering.

FUNCTION OF HANDLING IMPORTED AND INTERSTATE LABOR IS ONE FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Senator HAYDEN. Before you do that, I would like to ask Mr. Teague a question or two to see if I clearly understand what he has in mind.

Apparently, you agree with the bill, that it is a Federal function to arrange for the transportation of labor from outside of the State into another State?

Mr. TEAGUE. I do.

Senator HAYDEN. That has to be a Federal function.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. Now that proposition would have to be broken down into two fields; one dealing with transportation from one part of the United States to another part of the United States, and the other dealing with the importation of farm labor from Mexico or other places outside the United States.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes, sir

Senator HAYDEN. The importation of labor from Mexico, the West Indies, or other places, I take it, from your view, and I believe that your views are somewhat in accordance with some other ideas that I have heard expressed, could best be handled by a separate organization.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes. Yes; I think that you have got to have an authority over the whole thing.

Senator HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TEAGUE. But, I think you have to have separate personnel. You may have to have one to deal with Mexican nationals and another for perhaps the others.

Senator HAYDEN. The Bahamans are coming in now.

Mr. TEAGUE. The Bahamas or other places.

Senator HAYDEN. I think that is proper. It certainly seems to me to be a perfectly sound proposition. Of course, it all ought to be under one general supervision.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Senator HAYDEN. But, we could break it down in that way.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Senator HAYDEN. And that would not be a difficult matter to do in the bill. That is, we would not have to specify all of the details as to how it had to be done, provided the authority is given in the bill to take up this one phase of the importation of temporary workers from foreign countries into the United States.

QUESTION AS TO COST OF PROVIDING FARM LABOR

Senator HAYDEN. You spoke about a budget. Are you or your friends prepared to give us the budget figures as to what you think it would cost?

Mr. TEAGUE. No; I have agreed with Mr. O'Neal—I am going to be perfectly frank—I have agreed with Mr. O'Neal to withhold these figures and this complete plan and the budget until such time as we are satisfied.

PROGRAM SHOULD NOT BE ADMINISTERED BY FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Senator TYDINGS. I take it from your testimony that you are convinced that the F. S. A. is not the organization to perform efficiently and effectively this function of recruiting labor from Mexico.

Mr. TEAGUE. I am thoroughly convinced. I do not think that they have the right training or the administrative ability, or have the right type of people. It cannot be done by social workers.

Senator MCCARRAN. Now, right on that point, in view of the statement that was made before us day before yesterday, in which I was very much interested: It was stated that if we accepted the Extension Service that in a very short time we would find that the Extension Service personnel would be populated, so to speak, by the Farm Security group. In other words, it was said that the Farm Security group would take over the Extension Service. That was stated to us in such a way that it impressed me, and I am wondering if there is anything in it.

Mr. TEAGUE. I do not believe that is true. I think that the Agricultural Extension group, as a whole, are a very fine group of men who have earnestly worked with the farmers to improve their conditions, and that they have the confidence of the farmers, and I do not think that they are going to violate it by any such a process as you indicate.

Senator MCCARRAN. Personally, I do not doubt that it is a fact that they have been accepted by the farmers pretty much by and large; but there is this same socialization running through the Farm Security group that we find, rather through the Extension group that we find in the Farm Security group, and it is a socialization theory that has been the cause of the bogging down of this whole proposition up to date.

Mr. TEAGUE. Well, I agree with your latter statement, but that has not been our experience or mine, or those with whom I have talked with regard to the activities of the Extension Service in various parts of the country.

CONTRACTS OF THE GOVERNMENT WITH FARM GROWERS

Senator MCCARRAN. I would like to ask another question or two, Mr. Chairman, if I may. You have referred to the contracts with the growers. Would you give a short statement as to what they were, how they were brought about, and how they were affected?

Mr. TEAGUE. Why, Mr. McDaniel, who has been dealing with that, can give you a better idea of it than I can, but the principal thing is that they irritated the growers.

Senator MCCARRAN. First of all who were the contracting parties?

Mr. TEAGUE. The Farm Security Administration and the producers.

Senator MCCARRAN. All right.

HEAD TAX REQUIRED

Mr. TEAGUE. The principal functions that were irritating were first the head tax, which was required. The farmers feel that they are not primarily responsible for the shortage of this labor. The labor has been taken away from them by the Federal Government into defense plants and into the Army.

Senator McCarran. Who imposed the head tax?

Mr. Teague. The head tax, as I understand it, was imposed by the Farm Security Administration.

UNSATISFACTORY PROVISION ON FEEDING OF FARM WORKERS

The next provision that was irritating in the extreme was some of the feeding conditions. They made it optional with these fellows who came in from Mexico as to whether the farmer would be required to feed them or whether they would board themselves. A farmer didn't know. He had to be prepared both ways. They had the option, in other words. The option ought to be the other way. They have to be fed, of course; and if the farmer determines to have them feed themselves, he must furnish the facilities so that it can be done. That is only reasonable, and that is all right, you see.

Senator McCarran. Just one other question on that point. A few days ago——

Mr. Teague (interposing). May I say just one thing more before I leave that?

Senator McCarran. All right.

Mr. Teague. I just want to finish the thought, before it gets out of my mind.

Senator McCarran. Surely.

OBJECTION TO REQUIREMENT OF PERFORMANCE BOND

Mr. Teague. The next provision that was extremely irritating was that a performance bond was required of the producers, you see. Many of the small producers were not in a position to give a bond.

Senator McCarran. This bond was conditioned on the carrying out of certain requirements?

Mr. Teague. Yes. We have the feeling, Senator, that this is an obligation of the Government; that whatever guaranties are necessary to secure this labor, in the negotiations with Mexico, that the Government should make them, and they shouldn't be passed on. I don't think there is any need for any contracts at all with the producers.

NO ASSURANCE OF ABILITY OF WORKER

Senator Tydings. There was nothing in the bond, I take it, that gave the giver of the bond the assurance that the man would be skilled or able to do the work for which he was recruited. He had to take his chances on that?

Mr. Teague. Oh, yes; he had to take his chances on that, and he had to take his chances on whether the man wanted to work, or not. And many of them who were brought in were all right, and worked; but a lot of them who were brought in were recruited in Mexico City and were coming for a joy ride—and they were all sorts of people—taxi drivers and bartenders and clerks and people entirely unfitted for agricultural labor. That ought to be all eliminated.

PLACE OF RECRUITMENT OF MEXICAN LABOR

Senator McCarran. The next question I had was on that subject. Some few days ago, a very responsible witness came before this com-

mittee and dwelt on that very subject, that is, the section from which the Mexican labor was recruited; and he dwelt at length on the border labor, so to speak.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Senator McCARRAN. And the picture I got was that just over the border there were thousands upon thousands of Mexican people who were anxious, willing, and able to come over the line and do the work and do it well, because in the past they have been doing it for a long time, under very similar conditions.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes, sir.

PLACES OF RECRUITMENT OF FARM LABOR IN MEXICO FIXED BY MEXICAN GOVERNMENT

Senator McCARRAN. But, on the other hand, as I understood it, it was the Mexican Government which imposed the condition that these border people could not come across, and that the recruiting had to be done in Mexico City. Am I right on that?

Mr. TEAGUE. I am satisfied you are correct that the Government of Mexico did impose some restrictions on taking people from the border, for the reason they were flocking there in such numbers.

But I am convinced, Senator, that the Government of Mexico didn't insist that all these men be recruited in Mexico City, and I am convinced, if they did, that the proper representation to Mexico by our State Department would soon get that condition changed.

Senator McCARRAN. The whole matter has impressed me up to date this way, Mr. Chairman, that had it not been for the imposition of a volume of red tape, we would have had great relief in the way of labor coming over the Mexican border, in accordance with the practice that had been followed in years past, and that it would have been competent labor, experienced labor, and we would have been relieved of a lot of this trouble we now have.

Senator HOLMAN. Apparently the men wanted to come to the United States, because they were congregating along the border prepared to come over and perform farm work.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

IMPORTATION OF LABOR FROM MEXICO IN ABSENCE OF AN AGREEMENT WITH MEXICAN GOVERNMENT

Senator BANKHEAD. In view of your answer to Senator McCarren's question, in which you explained the attitude of the Government of Mexico, I want to develop another phase of the subject. Yesterday afternoon, this committee was visited by the House committee having jurisdiction over this bill, together with some Representatives from the districts bordering on Mexico in the Southwest.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes, sir.

Senator BANKHEAD. Several of them here said that if they were let alone, without any contract or anything else of that nature, but merely with a relaxation and suspension of the immigration laws, under proper restrictions, they could handle the situation themselves.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Senator BANKHEAD. What is your opinion about that, Mr. Teague?

Mr. TEAGUE. I understand there is some amendment in there dealing with that. But I can't conceive, Senator, that the Mexican Government could just throw open the border and let these people come at will in here. The Mexican Government could place reasonable restrictions in the areas along the border so that those areas could not be entirely disrupted.

Senator BANKHEAD. Your statement presents another phase of the problem, that is, although our Government may be willing, you think possibly the Mexican Government would not be willing.

Mr. TEAGUE. I don't pretend to be skilled in diplomacy in negotiations with the Mexican Government. But if I were in the position of the President of Mexico or the governors of States adjoining the border, I would insist upon reasonable regulations under which the Mexicans could cross the border.

Senator BANKHEAD. With the master contract in existence, what about the situation?

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. McDaniel, can you tell me whether in the master contract the area was definitely designated?

Mr. MCDANIEL. It was not.

Senator MCCARREN. What gave rise to this recruiting in Mexico City?

Senator BANKHEAD. I didn't get a satisfactory answer to the provisions of the master contract, whether under it they could throw open the border and let them come in. Could it be done under that contract?

Mr. TEAGUE. I understand the Mexican Government didn't let these people cross the border, and sent them back home.

Mr. MCDANIEL. I think I can answer that.

Senator BANKHEAD. I am not familiar with the detailed provisions of the contract.

Mr. MCDANIEL. I think I can go into that, if you wish.

Senator BROOKS. Before he does that, there are two or three suggestions here from the representatives of the border States, who come to us and say, "If you leave it to us to recruit them the way be have been recruiting them, we will get all the labor we want. We know them, and they know us, and we will get along."

MEXICAN FARM LABOR NEEDED BY SOME INTERIOR STATES

But there are some States in the interior of the United States, who need this labor, and who can't deal with them from day to day at the bridge. And there is certainly from your representation a desire to have brought about some means of dealing with them for the States farther in from the border. Do you think it is possible to let the border States deal with them for the border States, and also have some means of dealing with them for those in the interior?

Mr. TEAGUE. I think it is feasible, if done on an orderly basis of recruitment.

Senator BROOKS. I gather the Farm Security Administration is not to be trusted with this problem?

Mr. TEAGUE. In my judgment, they are not.

Senator BROOKS. Then I think, in view of the importance of this question, we ought to have the benefit, for the consideration of the

committee, of whatever plan you have in mind, in conjunction with Mr. O'Neal or anyone else who is going to agree with you. I think the committee should have the benefit of any such suggestions, before we pass on the bill, so that we might be properly apprized of what is going to be attempted to be put into operation, and so that we can understand more clearly what we should appropriate and what safeguards we should give that plan, if it is a good plan, in order to avoid what has been mentioned here, that is, the fellows in the Farm Security Administration putting on another hat and going over to the other bureau and setting up their own plan.

Mr. TEAGUE. Well, I have been frank with you. I was frank with Mr. O'Neal in the discussion of this thing, and with Mr. Ogg.

Mr. O'NEAL. We are in agreement, Mr. Teague; you go right ahead.

Senator BANKHEAD. Mr. O'Neal says he has no objection to your presenting it.

QUESTION AS TO PROCEEDING THROUGH STATE DEPARTMENT AS WELL AS LEGISLATIVELY

Senator TYDINGS. I have to leave without hearing you present that plan; and, without diverting you, I would like to ask this additional question. As I listen to this testimony, I am wondering if the bill we are going to pass eventually is going to be as wise as we hope it will be. I want to ask you whether you don't think it would be wise to call on the State Department now to begin conversations with the Mexican Government so that the labor under any plan we set up will not necessarily come from the central part of Mexico and will be, as far as possible, labor competent to do the work, in the interest of good will on the part of both governments and to avoid confusion.

It occurs to me, if we don't proceed simultaneously through the State Department, as well as legislatively, we may have an excellent plan, as far as we are concerned, but one which may break down because of the internal mechanics that may be used to put that plan into operation.

Mr. TEAGUE. The amendments which we propose, and on which I think we are now in agreement, do provide for just that procedure, Senator Tydings.

Further, I would like to say that we are just as anxious and just as willing as Mr. O'Neal and his organization, or these gentlemen along the border—that there shall be negotiated a better master contract than we have. But we don't want to see it go out until we have one which is better.

Senator TYDINGS. I have not so much reference to the master contract as to the labor involved, and I don't want to see the work going on and the program be lost. Whereas if the committee, with your consent and approval, would ask the State Department to take up proposition one, and two, and three, and be proceeding on that line, so that when the legislation is finally put into effect, that time would be saved. Because, after all, harvest time will be here before long; and, unless we have worked on the other phase of the problem, too, no matter what our legislative plan may be, there may not be time to put it into effective operation.

I will leave that question with you. I am in charge of an appropriation bill up on the Senate floor, and will have to leave.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. Senator Brooks, had you concluded your question?

Senator BROOKS. Yes, I had.

Senator RUSSELL. Then suppose we proceed with Mr. McDaniel, to have the whole picture.

Mr. TEAGUE. If you will do that; and then, if you desire, I will go ahead with this proposal which I expect to present to the Secretary of Agriculture.

PAST RECRUITMENT OF MEXICAN LABOR BY PRIVATE AGENCIES

Senator MCCARRAN. Before you leave that subject, is it not true that heretofore this whole problem has been satisfied by private agencies going into Mexico and recruiting and bringing groups of labor into the border States? Isn't that true to a large extent?

Mr. TEAGUE. I think that is true to a large extent, and could be done again.

Senator MCCARRAN. Am I right, or reasonably correct, in this statement, that labor in Mexico is largely handled by the padrone system? That is, you get in touch with the padrone, and he will bring your labor to you? They work in groups, to a considerable extent?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is true to a considerable extent. I think you have to know how they operate in Mexico.

(A discussion off the record followed.)

Senator RUSSELL. All right, Mr. McDaniel, we will now hear from you.

STATEMENT OF IVAN G. McDANIEL, REPRESENTING THE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS' LABOR COMMITTEE, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. MCDANIEL. Mr. Chairman, I might state first that I am engaged in agriculture as well as the practice of law. I am interested in the operation of a ranch on which we produce citrus and vegetables and some poultry. I have also specialized in agricultural law and represent the Agricultural Producers' Labor Committee, whose membership is composed of 95 percent of the growers of citrus in California and Arizona, and this committee directly cooperates with the producers of vegetables, deciduous tree crops and most of the other agricultural producers in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and other nearby States.

REQUIREMENTS UNDER FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION LABOR CONTRACTS DEALING WITH IMPORTED FARM LABOR

Senator McCarran raised a very interesting point on what was required in order to get labor under the contracts with the Farm Security Administration, and it will only take me a few moments to tell you the number of contracts we had to execute to do that.

It was first necessary to organize a corporation which we may speak of as the over-all corporation. That corporation then entered into a contract with the Farm Security Administration agreeing to take and distribute 1,500 Mexicans.

Each agricultural employer was then required to enter into a contract with the Farm Security Administration agreeing to pay certain wages and to employ the workers under certain conditions, including minimum hours of work per day, subsistence wage, minimum wage, and percentage of time worked under the contract.

Then the over-all corporation was required to put up a contract of indemnity that each employer would perform these conditions, which in most cases were matters already covered by State law, and each employer had to sign a contract of indemnity and either put up security or file financial statements satisfactory to the surety company that they would comply with the terms of the contract.

The surety company then put up a bond running to F. S. A., and we had to pay the premium on the bond; the face of the bond amounted to $60 per employer, with the bond conditioned upon faithful performance of the contract by each employer. The contract also provided that the employer had to be prepared to either board the worker at actual cost or furnish the equipment by which they could cook their own meals. The wish of 50 percent of the employees was to govern as to what the employer had to do. He had to be prepared for both alternatives. This placed a heavy and unnecessary burden upon him particularly where as now it is almost impossible to get priorities for the equipment needed.

REASONS FOR $5 HEAD FEE

Senator O'MAHONEY. What about this so-called head tax?

Mr. McDANIEL. It isn't a tax. It is a charge of $5 per man, to cover transportation.

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is separate and distinct from the $8 assessed by the Immigration Service?

Mr. McDANIEL. Yes, sir.

Senator O'MAHONEY. This is a charge for transportation?

Mr. McDANIEL. That is correct.

Senator O'MAHONEY. What is the basis of the charge?

Mr. McDANIEL. The basis of the charge is that it cost the Farm Security Administration, according to their figures, so many dollars to transport the men from Mexico, and F. S. A. believed the employer should pay a part of that cost. That is the first theory.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You said "tax."

Mr. McDANIEL. They call it a "fee." It is a misnomer to call it a tax. It isn't a tax. And the second theory of the Farm Security Administration was that if they charged this $5 fee per man, it would prevent the small farmer from coming in and asking for labor when he needed it for only a few days, because he could not afford to the pay the $5 per employee.

IMMIGRATION FEE OF $8 NOT REQUIRED

Senator BANKHEAD. Is the $8 entrance fee required, for a worker to enter the country?

Mr. McDANIEL. No; it is not required, under this arrangement.

FURTHER EXPLANATION OF $5 HEAD FEE

Senator O'MAHONEY. Do I quite understand what you mean there? Do you mean to give us the impression the Farm Security Administration wanted to prevent the small farmer from getting labor?

Mr. McDANIEL. They wanted to prevent, as they told me, having to deal with the individual farmer or with the farmer wanting labor only a short time. If they could require the setting up of an overall organization, such as they required in our case, where the central organization had to take the 1,500 workers and then redistribute them, the central organization being in the position of paying the $5 apiece, then they would not have to bother with the small farmer. The central organization by a series of cooperative employment contracts could use the labor over a much longer period of time, administratively. F. S. A. desired this centralized control of the farmer organizations.

Senator O' MAHONEY. Wasn't the $5 fee in some way concerned with the length of the trip which was involved in bringing the worker into the United States?

Mr. McDANIEL. No, sir; there was a $5 fee for all of these men brought from Mexico, without reference to the length of the trip.

As Mr. Teague suggests, the $5 per man was a very small thing compared with the total amount of money involved in transporting these workers, and it was one thing which was a great irritant to the farmers and to the organizations that had to be set up in order to get the workers. Organizations of this type were set up in Arizona, Imperial Valley, Calif., for cotton and vegetables, in the Salinas Valley for sugar beets, and at various places in the State for citrus growers. They could not get and properly handle these workers without providing such organizations and executing these series of employment controls.

I also want to say that the requirement for the $5 transportation fee and the requirement for the bond were not in the basic Mexican contract. They were imposed by the Farm Security Administration.

NUMBER OF WORKERS REQUIRED IN ARIZONA AND CALIFORNIA

Before proceeding to these proposed amendments, I want to give some figures here which I think Senator Hayden would be interested in. The University of Arizona estimates that by November and December, when the harvest peak in Arizona is reached, there will be needed in that State alone approximately 32,000 workers more than they could normally get under usual migration of labor. That migration, we are convinced, will be cut in half; so that Arizona will need more than 32,000, but we will assume that is the number needed.

We, in California, will need 50,000 workers, by a period between July and October, to handle our citrus, vegetables, sugar beets, cotton, and so forth—making a total of approximately 82,000 workers that will have to be brought into that area to handle these crops we expect to have in the ground, but by the way, are not all planted, and won't be planted unless labor is made available.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION ESTIMATE OF WORKERS TO BE BROUGHT IN

The Farm Security Administration estimate they can bring in approximately 1,500 a month, and I hope this is true and that they will be able to increase this amount. They have never brought in anywhere near that number before. But, assuming they can bring in that number by October, they will not have brought in more than from 10 to 12 percent of the labor we must have. So the program, as they are now working it, cannot possibly meet the requirements; it must be supplemented in some manner.

Senator HOLMAN. May I ask a question now?

Mr. MCDANIEL. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLMAN. A few minutes ago the testimony was given that an estimated 8,000 migrant laborers a month were coming into the country. I wasn't sure whether that was the estimate for California alone, or for the entire American problem.

Mr. MCDANIEL. No; I don't believe that was an estimate of the amount coming in, but it was an estimate of the amount needed per month.

Senator HOLMAN. I understand that. But was the estimate based on California's needs alone, or for the entire United States?

Mr. MCDANIEL. No; just for California and Arizona. That doesn't include any of the other crops, in Oregon, Washington, or any of the other States, but just California and Arizona.

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED

Without going into any other statistics, Mr. Ogg, representing the Farm Bureau, myself, and representatives of other farm groups have sought to prepare a series of amendments to meet what was considered to be defects in this present bill. These amendments have been agreed to by the National Grange, Mr. Goss, who testified here, and the National Council of Farmers' Cooperatives, and this morning by Mr. O'Neal, representing the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Isn't that correct, Mr. O'Neal?

Mr. O'NEAL. That is right.

Mr. MCDANIEL. Did you wish to make a statement about it now, Mr. O'Neal?

Mr. O'NEAL. No; they are all right. I am in agreement with the gentlemen.

INSERTION OF WORDS "AND PAID"

Mr. MCDANIEL. The first amendment is on page 2, at line 4; after the word "apportioned" insert "and paid," making it read "apportioned and paid to the States." That will prevent the necessity of a lot of bookkeeping.

On page 2, line 22, after the first letters in the line, "t-i-o-n-e-d," write in there the same insert, "and paid."

INSERTION OF THE WORD "MORE" IN LIEU OF THE WORD "LESS"

On page 2, line 19, strike out the word "less" and insert the word "more"—so as to make it read "not more than $100,000."

AMENDMENTS TO CLARIFY HOW FUNDS FOR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WILL BE HANDLED

For the next amendment, we go to page 3, line 5, strike out all after the word "available" and all of the lines 6 to 19, inclusive, and the first four words of line 20, and substitute therefor the following:

and paid to the Federal Office of Extension and to the State extension services as herein provided, to carry out either through its own organization or by cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service or any State agency or agencies.

And I stop reading the amendment to make a comment. This portion is to meet the suggestion you made, Senator Russell, that it wasn't definite as to how that twelve million was to be handled, and to meet the suggestion of Senator Hayden as to agencies within the States.

Senator RUSSELL. That is right.

AMENDMENT TO PERMIT EMPLOYMENT SERVICE TO RECRUIT LABOR IN A STRIKE AREA

Mr. MCDANIEL. And the language continues:

notwithstanding any other provisions of law or regulation, the purposes and provisions of this act,

That is put in there to prevent the invoking of the regulation by which, if a strike is called in an area, the United States Employment Service can be prevented from further operation. As an example, during a strike in Ventura County a couple of years ago by the farm hands, induced by labor organizers, the union went up and down the county and got the names of the farmers off the mail boxes and filed those with the Employment Service, and from then on none of the farmers in that county could get any help from the United States Employment Service.

INTENTION TO DEPRIVE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE OF AUTHORITY

Senator O'MAHONEY. Is it intended by that particular provision and the language that precedes it, to deprive the Secretary of Agriculture of any authority?

Mr. MCDANIEL. Yes, sir; I think that is the purpose of the bill as it passed the House.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You want to deprive not only the Farm Security Administration, but the Secretary of Agriculture also?

Mr. MCDANIEL. Yes, sir; under this authority.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You want to deprive him of any authority over this money?

AMENDMENT RELATING TO AGREEMENT FOR IMPORTATION OF LABOR

Mr. MCDANIEL. Yes, sir. Continuing with the amendment—

for recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to State, and imported workers, including the payment of the necessary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and protection of such workers en route, and including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for a

period not to exceed 30 days after the enactment of this act for the importation of workers from Mexico and the Bahamas under existing agreements, after which time the agency designated herein shall take over and carry out these agreements until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Government of Mexico and the Government of the United States and the existing agreement between the Government of the Bahamas and the Government of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico and the Bahamas can be renegotiated by the Secretary of State with such Governments, so as to carry out the purposes and limitations of this Act.

That is designed to allow the Farm Security Administration to continue for not more than 30 days after the passage of the act, when the Extension Service will take over and continue to operate until a new agreement can be negotiated by the Secretary of State with the foreign country.

AMENDMENT TO CLARIFY AUTHORITY TO ISSUE RULES AND REGULATIONS

The next proposed amendment is on page 4, lines 5, 6, and 7, to strike out the following:

subject to general rules and regulations to be issued by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the United States Employment Services.

I think there was a conflict of authority there as to who was to issue the rules and regulations; and since the Extension Service has authority to issue regulations under their own laws, there is no need to have it in.

Mr. OGG. May I say, Senator Russell, you raised a question about that, and we thought it should come out.

Senator RUSSELL. It occurred to me it did create considerable conflict, and did not serve any useful purpose.

AMENDMENT RELATING TO AUTHORITY TO ALLOCATE AND PAY FUNDS TO CARRY OUT COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. MCDANIEL. And insert in lieu thereof the following proviso:

Provided further, That the necessary funds to carry out such cooperative agreements may be allocated and paid by the Federal Office of Extension to the cooperating agency.

ELIMINATION OF PROVISO REQUIRING CONSENT FOR MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

The next proposed amendment is on page 4, lines 7 to 17, strike out the following:

Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, or for the transportation of any worker outside the limits of the State where he resides or is working without the prior consent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture for such State or other official who performs similar functions for such State.

That is the portion of the act dealing with the limitations which may be imposed by the county agents and to which Congressman Miller referred this morning. We think lines 7 to 17 should go out entirely.

Senator HAYDEN. That is the amendment which was offered and

adopted on the floor of the House, without committee consideration?

Mr. McDaniel. Yes, sir.

AMENDMENT RELATING TO FIXING OF STANDARDS FOR AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Then on page 5, line 24, after the colon, insert the following:

: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall prevent the Government of the United States——

Senator O'Mahoney (interposing). May I interrupt? What is the language immediately preceding the colon, because you are reading from a different print?

Mr. McDaniel. I will take the whole provision (reading):

: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of sections 3 (f), 7 (c), and 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act—

And then follows the insert.

Senator O'Mahoney. Thank you.

Mr. McDaniel (reading):

: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall prevent the Government of the United States itself through the agencies designated herein, giving proper assurance to foreign Governments that such workers shall not be discriminated against, nor from using such funds for carrying out existing agreements with a foreign Government until such time as the existing agreements can be renegotiated by the Secretary of State with such Governments, so as to carry out the purposes and limitations of this Act, but no provision of this Act or any existing law shall authorize the War Manpower Commission, the War Labor Board, or the Director of Economic Stabilization, or any other agency of the Federal Government now existing or hereafter created, to make applicable to agriculture (which shall include all operations which are included within the provisions of section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code or section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended) any of the regulations, standards, or requirements which are described in the preceding proviso.

I might say that definition of agriculture has been accepted by both Houses.

AMENDMENT WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF HEAD TAX AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS UNDER IMMIGRATION ACT

There is just one more amendment we propose to add to the bill, at the end thereof, on page 6. I might say this amendment has to do with the opening of the border. Mr. Shaughnessy and Mr. Finucane and also Mr. Devaney, of the Immigration Service, were very kind to work with us this morning in preparing this amendment; and two of them are here now, in case you desire to ask any questions of them. The proposed amendment follows:

Provided further, That in order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of residents of Mexico or of the Bahamas desiring to perform agricultural labor (as defined herein) in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war any such resident desiring to enter

the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917—

that is the tax you were speaking about this morning, Senator—

and shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of section 3 of such act which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage by corporations, foreign governments, or others; and any such resident shall be admitted to perform agricultural labor (as defined herein) in the United States for such time and under such conditions (but not including the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States) as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General. Such residents shall be required to present an identification card prescribed under such regulations which shall be in lieu of all other documentary requirements, including the registration at time of entry or after entry required by the Alien Registration Act of 1940. Any such resident admitted under the foregoing provisions who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted—

that is, as an agricultural laborer—

or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission shall be taken into custody under a warrant issued by the Attorney General at any time after entry and deported in accordance with section 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 917. Sections 5 and 6 of such Act shall not apply to the importation of aliens under this Act. No provision of this Act shall authorize the admission into the United Sates of any enemy alien.

PROVISION FOR RETURN OF IMPORTED FARM LABORERS

Senator HOLMAN. I am very much concerned about returning these immigrants finally to Mexico, or wherever they may be from.

Mr. MCDANIEL. Yes.

Senator HOLMAN. Just what is the provision which requires their exodus?

Mr. MCDANIEL. As we conceive this, the Mexican who comes over will come over as an agricultural worker; he will have a card with his fingerprints and his name, and he can remain only so long as he is an agricultural worker and during the period of the war, after which he is required, under the conditions of entry, to go back to Mexico.

Senator HOLMAN. How are you going to find him?

Mr. MCDANIEL. The Immigration Service this morning thought they could find them and take them back.

Senator HOLMAN. I have a conflict in my mind. It is planned to facilitate the entry of needed agricultural labor to harvest these vital crops, vital to the war effort.

Mr. MCDANIEL. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLMAN. I have the other thought that I do not want to permit, under this proposal to get bona fide labor, all the hordes of Europe coming into our neighboring countries, to come into this country as permanent residents, under the guise of Mexican agricultural labor, or transient labor.

Mr. MCDANIEL. You see, we are not waiving the requirements of section 3 of the act, except in these very limited particulars; and all the other restrictions against entry by aliens will remain in effect.

Senator HOLMAN. Do you think we can recapture those undesirable persons, or those persons who merely use this permission to get into the United States to evade the immigration laws? How are

we going to recapture those people after they once get into this country?

Mr. McDaniel. As I understand this, first they will be sorted at the border when they come in, so that all the requirements of section 3, except those specifically waived, are met.

Senator Holman. By whom will they be assorted?

Mr. McDaniel. By the immigration authorities, in accordance with the immigration laws, which are not waived. Then it will be the job of the immigration authorities to pick them up or send them back, or be the duty of the States to see they are sent back.

Mr. Teague. I think it should be the job of the distribution agencies in the various States to keep track of these men, to report them back immediately they cease working for them.

Senator Holman. And to report missing ones.

Mr. Teague. Yes, sir; absolutely.

Senator Holman. With a description of them.

Mr. Teague. Absolutely, so that they can be picked up immediately.

USE OF THEM "CITIZEN OF MEXICO" IN LIEU OF "RESIDENT OF MEXICO"

Senator O'Mahoney. The problem causing Senator Holman some difficulty could be very easily solved if, instead of using the term "residents of Mexico," you should say "citizens of Mexico."

Mr. McDaniel. Yes, sir.

Senator O'Mahoney. Why did you use "residents" instead of "citizens"?

Mr. McDaniel. We discussed it this morning and were undecided whether to use the word "residents" or "citizens." There are some residents of Mexico who are Chinese, who are good workers—and we hadn't fully decided which word to use. There are several thousand good Chinese farm workers in Mexico.

Senator O'Mahoney. And so long as you use the word "resident," which means any person, whether a citizen of Mexico or not, who happens to be temporarily in Mexico would be entitled to admission.

Mr. McDaniel. We have no objection to changing it and putting in "citizens."

Senator Holman. By the use of "citizens," which I prefer, do you feel it would seriously impair your ability to get the vitally needed harvest labor?

Mr. McDaniel. I don't think so.

Senator Holman. May I ask that the word "citizen" be used instead of "resident"?

Mr. McDaniel. That would be entirely satisfactory to us, Senator.

Would it be satisfactory to you, Mr. O'Neal?

Mr. O'Neal. Yes, sir.

AMENDMENT RELATING TO AUTHORITY OF COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION TO PRESCRIBE REGULATIONS

Senator O'Mahoney. Let me call your attention to this language, in the middle of the proposed amendment: "and any such resident" —which may be changed to "citizen"—

Mr. McDaniel. Yes.

Senator O'Mahoney. (reading):

and any such resident shall be admitted to perform agricultural labor (as defined herein) in the United States for such time and under such conditions (but not including the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States) as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General.

Mr. McDaniel. Yes, sir.

Senator O'Mahoney. Do you intend by that language to vest in the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization the power to set forth the requirements which must be met by each applicant for admission, before he can be admitted?

Mr. McDaniel. Well, except as this proviso itself limits it, yes. But otherwise we expect the Commissioner of Immigration to lay down the regulations such as you were inquiring about, that the employer must report when a man disappears, and so forth, but that such regulations shall be in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, rather than a hinderance to its operation.

Senator O'Mahoney. Let me put this example.

Mr. McDaniel. Yes.

Senator O'Mahoney. An applicant comes to the border, and says "I want to enter the United States as an agricultural worker." Will that statement alone be sufficient to permit him to enter, or must he show that there is a job awaiting him?

Mr. McDaniel. I don't think he will have to show there is a job awaiting him; but he will have to show he complies with all the other requirements of section 3. It would not be within the province of the Commissioner of Immigration to determine for example any of the terms of conditions of employment, but only to see that the entry was made in accordance with Section 3, that his status was maintained as an agricultural worker, and that he was returned at the proper time.

Senator O'Mahoney. And whatever other requirements the Commissioner of Immigration desires to impose?

Mr. McDaniel. That is right, but in furtherance of the purposes of this act.

Senator O'Mahoney. And you are not asking here any limitation upon that authority?

Mr. McDaniel. Not here. I don't see how we can lay down in sufficient detail what those limitations may be. For example, there are certain Mexican laborers who come across the border daily, who work in the United States and live in Mexico.

Senator O'Mahoney. Of course, that is one of the primary difficulties we have.

Mr. McDaniel. It is; yes, sir.

Senator O'Mahoney. This whole dispute arises from the fact that the Farm Security Administration laid down regulations we thought unwise and altogether too onerous. But there is nothing in this provision that would prevent the Commissioner of Immigration from laying down regulations which six months from now we may not find also to be onerous.

Mr. McDaniel. Except insofar as we have waived certain requirements, and so far as this act asserts certain purposes which the immigration authorities must further rather than impede.

Senator O'Mahoney. With that exception.

Mr. McDaniel. And we were of the opinion those waivers were sufficiently broad.

Senator O'Mahoney. That is one of the difficulties involved in giving any administrative official the power to make rules and regulations.

Mr. McDaniel. Yes, sir.

Senator Russell. If they are going to have the responsibility of returning these people to their country, they must then have some authority for drawing the necessary rules and regulations for locating them and returning them.

Senator O'Mahoney. Surely.

Senator Holman. May I make the suggestion that it would behoove those who are to use this labor to report to their Senators and their Members of Congress any abuses in the administration of this act by the immigration authorities.

Mr. McDaniel. I think that is a very good suggestion.

Senator Holman. Because if there isn't that cooperation, there will be drastic curtailment of permits of immigration, which may later work a hardship on the agricultural industry that now desires to be served.

Mr. McDaniel. Yes, sir. We conceive there must be some reasonable regulation, even with these restrictions removed, and you can't just let anybody come in under unregulated conditions.

Senator Russell. Have you concluded, Mr. McDaniel?

Mr. McDaniel. Yes, sir; and I will offer the amendments in full at this time as a part of the record.

(The amendments referred to are as follows:)

Amendments to House Joint Resolution 96

1. On page 2, line 4, after the fourth word, "apportioned", add "and paid".
2. On page 2, line 22, after the letters "tioned" add "and paid".
3. On page 2, line 19, strike out the word "less" and insert the word "more".
4. On page 3, line 5, strike out all after the word "available" and all of the lines 6 to 19, inclusive, and the first four words of line 20, and substitute therefor the following:

"and paid to the Federal Office of Extension and to the State Extension Services as herein provided, to carry out either through its own organization or by cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service or any State agency or agencies, notwithstanding any other provisions of law or regulation, the purposes and provisions of this Act, for recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to State, and imported workers, including the payment of the necessary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing and protection of such workers en route, and including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for a period not to exceed 30 days after the enactment of this Act for the importation of workers from Mexico and the Bahamas under existing agreements, after which time the agency designated herein shall take over and carry out these agreements until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreements between the Government of Mexico and the Government of the United States and the existing agreement between the Government of the Bahamas and the Government of the United States with respect to the imporation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico and the

Bahamas can be renegotiated by the Secretary of State with such Governments so as to carry out the purposes and limitations of this Act.

On page 4, lines 5, 6, and 7, strike out the following:

"subject to general rules and regulations to be issued by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the United States Employment Services."

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"*Provided further*, That the necessary funds to carry out such cooperative agreements may be allocated and paid by the Federal Office of Extension to the cooperating agency."

6. On page 4, lines 7 to 17, strike out the following:

"*Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, or for the transportation of any worker outside the limits of the State where he resides or is working without the prior consent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture for such State or other official who performs similar functions for such State."

7. On page 5, line 24, after the colon insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That nothing herein shall prevent the Government of the United States itself through the agencies designated herein, giving proper assurance to foreign Governments that such workers shall not be discriminated against, nor from using such funds for carrying out existing agreements with a foreign Government, until such time as the existing agreement can be renegotiated by the Secretary of State with such Government so as to carry out the purposes and limitations of this Act, but no provision of this Act or any existing law shall authorize the War Manpower Commission, the War Labor Board, or the Director of Economic Stabilization, or any other agency of the Federal Government now existing or hereafter created to make applicable to agriculture (which shall include all operations which are included within the provisions of section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code, or section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended) any of the regulations, standards, or requirements which are described in the preceding proviso:"

Page 6, before the period in line 2 insert:

": *Provided further*, That in order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of residents of Mexico or of the Bahamas desiring to perform agricultural labor (as defined herein) in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war any such resident desiring to enter the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of section 3 of such Act which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage by corporations, foreign governments, or others; and any such resident shall be admitted to perform agricultural labor (as defined herein) in the United States for such time and under such conditions (but not including the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States) as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General. Such residents shall be required to present an identification card prescribed under such regulations which shall be in lieu of all other documentary requirements, including the registration at time of entry or after entry required by the Alien Registration Act of 1940. Any such resident admitted under the foregoing provisions who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission shall be taken into custody under a warrant issued by the Attorney General at any time after entry and deported in accordance with section 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917. Sections 5 and 6 of such Act shall not apply to the importation of aliens under this Act. No provision of this Act shall authorize the admission into the United States of any enemy alien."

TELEGRAM FROM AGRICULTURAL COUNCIL OF ARKANSAS

Senator RUSSELL. For the benefit of the record, I would like to read a telegram addressed to Senators Caraway and McClellan, which they

have requested be placed in the record. The telegram is from West Memphis, Ark., March 24, 1943 [reading]:

Missouri Pacific Railroad advises two passenger cars ordered by Farm Security Administration March 26 transport workers from Yellville to California. Apparently they are trying to move workers out of Arkansas before House Joint Resolution 96 becomes effective. Appreciate your presenting this Senate deficiency subcommittee on appropriations now holding hearing.

AGRICULTURAL COUNCIL OF ARKANSAS,
H. R. ADAMS, *Secretary-Manager.*

Mr. McDANIEL. Mr. Chairman, may I make just one more comment, and that is this, that this relaxation of these immigration laws would not take the place of the program for importing labor under the other provisions of this act, but would simply supplement it.

NEED FOR SEPARATING IMPORTATION OF LABOR AND INTERSTATEMENT MOVEMENT OF LABOR

Senator HAYDEN. Let me make a suggestion, Mr. Chairman, which I made earlier to Mr. Teague. I think in the pending measure and in the proposed amendment the transportation of workers from one part of the United States to another part of the United States is thoroughly scrambled together with the importation of workers from abroad into the United States. I just cannot help but feel that if your amendment provided for a separate, independent set-up to take care of the importation of farm labor from abroad, that phase of the problem would be better provided for in the bill.

Mr. McDANIEL. Yes, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. I wish you gentlemen would give a little thought to that.

Mr. McDANIEL. Yes.

Senator RUSSELL. I agree with you, that the committee will have to explore all the possibilities.

Senator HAYDEN. Let us just look at the situation as a practical matter. In the case of interstate labor, you have the Extension Service and the United States Employment Service operating in the United States, trying to find out when the workers have finished picking cotton in Arkansas, Missouri, and Texas. Maybe these workers are then needed farther out west to do some work. There is no restriction on their moving back and forth, since they are all American citizens and do not have the responsibility of returning to a certain point when they finish their job.

On the other hand, the importation of the inhabitants of the West Indies and Mexico presents a different problem. They are not American citizens, and you have to fix the responsibility for returning them after they have served their purpose in coming to this country. In my judgment you have to have this phase of the program headed up in a little different way, and I think you will find it more practicable to break the problem in two propositions, rather than have it as it is proposed here.

Mr. McDANIEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. TEAGUE. I would just suggest this, that the plan we propose here was a plan for the importation of Mexican labor. It would be set up under the Federal Government.

Senator HAYDEN. That is right.

Mr. TEAGUE. I couldn't speak for the other border States. I think this plan, if successful, and this same organization, can just be expanded to recruit for any Mexican labor needed in the other States. And I want you gentlemen to have that in mind, that we are not asking for any advantage of other states—but I couldn't speak for the others.

RECRUITMENT OF MEXICAN LABOR FROM ACROSS BORDER LINE

Senator HAYDEN. It seems to me you have made an intensely practical suggestion. I can understand perfectly why there are those along the Mexican border who prefer the old arrangement, if it can be made, which is that they simply go to the border and say, "Here is a job for you; come on over and take it."

The difficulty about that old operation is that the Mexican Government up to now would not consent to it.

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is the difficulty, Senator.

Senator HAYDEN. Yes, up to now. On the other hand, the master agreement was made before the crisis with respect to agricultural labor developed in the United States. So that our State Department is in a much better position to present a new case, relating to new circumstances, to the Mexican Government, than it was at the time this arrangement was made. The basic conditions have changed, and I am very hopeful that the Mexican Government can be persuaded, under suitable regulations, to permit recruitment along the border.

I can understand perfectly why the Mexican Government would say: "If we pass the word all around Mexico that all you have to do is go to the United States and get a job, workers would crowd up along the border. They are not being permitted by our authorities to do that, because there are no adequate arrangements for them and it would lead to be a very serious social problem."

Under these circumstances, the Mexican Government would simply have to send the workers back home, feed them, or otherwise provide for them.

NEED FOR SEPARATING IMPORTATION OF LABOR AND INTERSTATE LABOR

But returning to this basic idea, I think if you will try to provide in your main organization a set-up with nothing to do but get men from outside the United States who are aliens, to come into this country and work for a time and then return home, that would be about all one man can do.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is just our plan.

Senator HAYDEN. We had a program through the Employment Service where the need for labor in one place could be met with labor ascertained to be available in another. Then the question comes in: Who is going to provide the transportation, in view of the gasoline and rubber situation? This presents a new problem, but one which can be handled. I just don't think it is good business administration to scramble those two operations together; but if you could segregate them, you would be better off.

Mr. OGG. Mr. Chairman, could I clarify our position on that?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes, Mr. Ogg.

Mr. OGG. As far as our position is concerned, every area of our 44-State organization is unanimous, as far as I know, that we are opposed to setting up any new bureau in the Department of Agriculture to deal with this labor problem. We have tried that approach with respect to the Farm Security Administration, and they are in the process of trying to set up a new bureau, and it has just created hopeless confusion. We feel with the planting season right on us, Senator, that the only hope to get this job done in time to save the situation is to take the agencies we have already, namely, the Extension Service and the United States Employment Service, which have Nation-wide organizations throughout the United States and which, if given this responsibility, could be in action overnight.

And we would like to strongly recommend that you not amend the bill to divide that responsibility.

Senator HAYDEN. Let me make myself perfectly clear. I am not proposing to supersede either the Extension Service or the United States Employment Service by setting up an agency that is utterly independent of them, or that would be at cross purposes with them, or that would not be subordinate to the main authority. I am only thinking of the practical administration. When you want to get labor from the Bahamas or when you want to get labor from Mexico, there ought to be somebody in the organization who would have that as his particular job.

Mr. OGG. I see.

Senator HAYDEN. I feel that type of organization would be better than having the two distinct operations scrambled together.

Mr. OGG. I think that is provided for, Senator, in a provision of this act which authorizes the Extension Service—either the Federal Office of Extension in cooperation with the States affected, or any one State, or an agency in any one State, or in any group of States—the extension directors can get together independently and work out an agreement either with the United States Employment Service or with an agency of the State. In California, they are setting up a special agency in that State.

Senator HAYDEN. I noticed an article on that action and put it in the record of this hearing the other day.

Mr. OGG. The thought there was to preserve the full responsibility in one agency, the Extension Service, but to permit them to utilize any agency by agreement to handle the Mexican labor. But you would keep your responsibility clearcut—and that is the philosophy of this bill.

Senator HAYDEN. I am not suggesting that the agencies to work at cross purposes at all.

Mr. OGG. I see.

RESPONSIBILITY IN BILL FOR INTERSTATE AND INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

Senator RUSSELL. Who do you think does have the responsibility under this bill as to the interstate and international movement of this labor? Isn't it the Federal Office of Extension?

Mr. OGG. The Federal Office of Extension, in cooperation with the Extension Service in the States.

Senator RUSSELL. I can understand that. But it seems to me if it is going to be headed up and expedited, it will have to be done by the Federal Office of Extension, at least as far as your international contracts are concerned.

METHOD BY WHICH FUNDS WOULD BE ADMINISTERED

Mr. OGG. As I view that, Senator, they would set up a unit in the Federal Office of Extension, probably to handle this whole farm labor problem. But so far as the intrastate work is concerned, it would be all decentralized and turned over to the States. As to the interstate, it would seem to me the bill as now written would require the Federal Office of Extension to call in the directors of extension, and they would sit down together and work out a cooperative agreement with the Employment Service. But necessarily they would have to have a unit in the Federal Office of Extension to direct that operation.

STATES NOT LIKELY TO RELEASE FARM LABOR

Senator RUSSELL. The Federal Office of Extension or some Federal agency is going to have to have some authority. I read that telegram more or less maliciously a while ago, to show that you are going to have difficulty in getting any State official to consent to having farm labor moved out of the State. They would never concede they could spare one worker to go out of the State.

INSUFFICIENCY OF AMOUNT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

And if you have this in the Federal Office of Extension, you now propose to limit them to $100,000 for administrative expenses, including travel. Suppose you had a conflict between the States of Arizona and Wyoming——

Senator O'MAHONEY (interposing). That would be absolutely impossible. Make a reasonable assumption, Mr. Chairman.

Senator RUSSELL. I think you would find it isn't such an unreasonable assumption, if they got ready to move a number of workers from Wyoming to Arizona. Dr. Wilson, or somebody from Washington, would have to go out and try to settle it. And yet you have this limit of $100,000.

I want to decentralize this thing as far as possible, and I am heartily in accord with that idea. But when you go to depending upon the Extension Service in Georgia to try to cooperate and help the Extension Service in Michigan, or try in Michigan to help the farmers in Oregon, you are going to find out they are not going to do it—and they wouldn't be human unless they did react that way. They are employed and paid by the States, and their tenure of office very largely depends upon the States. So they are not going to help you move any worker from one State to another, which seems to be the purpose of this bill.

Under this bill, if you brought 10,000 Mexican laborers into Arizona, you couldn't ship them through to another State unless the Commis-

sioner of Agriculture in Arizona gave his consent. And how many times would he give his consent? He would stop a train as soon as it got in the State, and would refuse to consent to that labor being transported anywhere else.

NEED FOR OVER-ALL AUTHORITY

As far as interstate and international transportation agreements are concerned, it would seem to me some Federal agency is going to have to have over-all authority, because your State agencies are not going to be able to agree.

INADVISABILITY OF HAVING CENTRALIZED AUTHORITY CLEAR ALL AGREEMENTS

Mr. OGG. The thing we hope you will not get into this bill is that clearance with somebody in Washington will have to be had every time a move is made—in other words, centralized authority so that before they can move, on hiring any employees of the States or on entering into any agreements locally, it would have to be cleared—because that would just bog it down.

MOVEMENT OF LABOR FROM STATE TO STATE AND FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES INTO THE UNITED STATES SHOULD BE UNDER NATIONAL SUPERVISION

Senator HAYDEN. I think you are right on that. Ninety percent of the relief under this bill is obtaining help within the State, which ought to be completely decentralized. Let the State do it. But when you come to the movement of farm labor from one State to another, and from a foreign country into the United States, then I think the chairman is perfectly sound in that, that there has to be national supervision. You just can't handle it on any other basis.

Mr. OGG. Isn't that cared for under the bill now, which provides the Federal Office of Extension shall have over-all supervision?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes; I think your amendment strengthens that a good deal; but then you limit it to $100,000 for administration.

Mr. OGG. I don't know that $100,000 for administration will be enough. Maybe it won't. But we wanted to place some limit so that we wouldn't build up an unnecessarily large supervisory staff.

Senator HAYDEN. We are all with you on that.

Senator RUSSELL. Nobody wants you to do any more in that respect than you have to do. But if you have a job to do, you have to do it, and you can't just hope on it.

Mr. OGG. If in your judgment additional funds are needed, I think we would be willing to abide by your judgment. As far as we are concerned, we felt that was enough. But if it isn't, we want the job to be done, of course. Thank you, Senator.

RESOLUTION AS DRAWN WOULD ELIMINATE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Senator O'MAHONEY. An interesting point to me here is the testimony of Mr. McDaniel that the purpose of these amendments is to eliminate the Secretary of Agriculture altogether.

Senator RUSSELL. That is not only the purpose of the amendments, but it was stated very frankly on the floor of the House, when it was under consideration, that the bill was deliberately drawn to eliminate the Secretary of Agriculture.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The department or division of extension is a branch of the Department of Agriculture. The director is Milburn L. Wilson, with an assistant director, Reuben Brigham, and two assistants to the director. Under the terms of this proposed amendment, which provides an appropriation not to exceed $100,000 for this Federal agency headed by Mr. Wilson, we are likely, are we not, to run into this curious situation, that we are setting up, in a subordinate of the Secretary of Agriculture, power and discretion which we have denied to his chief? So that the arrangements which are made by the Secretary's subordinate and the State extension agents are to be altogether free from the control or suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture. It strikes me that is not a particularly good administrative procedure.

The statute, title 7, section 341, provides:

> In order to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same, there may be inaugurated in connection with the college or colleges in each State receiving the benefits of the provisions of sections 301–308, 321–328 of this title, agricultural extension work which shall be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

It strikes me that, in this legislation, what has happened has been that out of exasperation with what seemed to be the stupid action of one of the agencies, the Farm Security Administration, in attempting to impose intolerable or at least very annoying regulations upon the employment of agricultural labor, we are undertaking to slash out in such a fashion as to create a new problem.

The Secretary of Agriculture has, as I understand it, undertaken to deal with this question of agricultural labor, only recently. He has taken the work out of the hands of the Farm Security Administration. He has done already, as I understand it, what you are asking in this legislation. And I take it that a suggestion from the committee that Farm Security Administration or any of its agents should not have anything more to do with the administration of this, would be quite sufficient. In any event, I take it that a provision in the bill to that effect would be altogether effective.

But I can't get away from the conclusion that we may be creating more difficulty for ourselves if we undertake to step into the Department of Agriculture and say that the head of that department shall have nothing to do or say about a matter of such tremendous importance to agriculture. Speaking quite frankly, if a particular head of a department is not doing a job the way it ought to be done, the remedy is not to wreck the law, but to get a new head.

Mr. OGG. That is the purpose of this bill.

Senator O'MAHONEY. No; the purpose of this bill is to utterly change the machinery.

Mr. OGG. Could I make a statement about that, Senator?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Yes.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION AGAINST SETTING UP NEW AGENCY TO CARRY OUT LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. OGG. I would like to say I can't speak for any other organizations, but I am sure I am correct when I say so far as our organization is concerned, that the purpose you have stated is not, except to a very partial extent, the purpose we have in supporting this legislation. Merely to take Farm Security Administration out of this will not solve the problem.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I see.

Mr. OGG. The thing we feel is the fundamental principle, as we see it, involved in this question, is whether you are going to confer the authority and appropriate the money to the Secretary of Agriculture or whether you are going to confer the authority and appropriate the money to the Federal Office of Extension in cooperation with the States under the enabling clause.

Senator O'MAHONEY. But what you are doing is to say, "We don't like the way discretionary authority is exercised by A, and we are going to set up B and give him the power to exercise the discretionary authority."

Mr. OGG. I believe if you will let me complete my statement I can clear this matter up as to the purpose and objective of this bill. There is nothing in this directed against the Secretary of Agriculture. himself, as far as we are concerned. We are just up against an emergency, with the planting season at hand. And if this planning authority is given to a new bureau in the Department of Agriculture—and I don't care what bureau it is—a new bureau just created a few weeks ago, and if they have to set up offices all over the United States, as they propose to do under their plan, and those offices have to establish their relations with these other agencies, and if they, the Extension Service in the States, have to clear all of their activities and their policies and their personnel and all of that with this bureau, we will never get this job done. That is the real reason.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I think that is perfectly sound; I agree with you.

Mr. OGG. That is the real reason, Senator. We are up against the gun, to use a slang expression. The planting season is right upon us.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I understand that.

Mr. OGG. And we don't want to be caught in a situation where we are bogged down in a maze of bureaucracy.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I understand. That is perfectly clear.

Mr. OGG. Sure.

Senator O'MAHONEY. But what you are recommending to this committee is exactly the same as though we should recommend to the Farm Bureau Federation that the executive authority of the president of that association, Mr. O'Neal, should be set aside and full power given to Mr. Ogg.

Mr. O'NEAL. Let me answer it from a legal point of view.

SUGGESTION THAT FUNDS BE ADMINISTRED BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE THROUGH EXTENSION SERVICE

Senator HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think I have the thought; let me offer it. It won't take but a minute. Could not the bill contain language which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, through the already organized Federal Office of Extension in the Department, and not others, to do certain things?

Senator O'MAHONEY. That would do the job.

Mr. O'NEAL. Senator O'Mahoney, you haven't read the bill, have you, as it passed the House?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes, I have.

Mr. O'NEAL. I think you gentlemen are a little confused here with this Mexican thing, and you have gotten all mixed up. It is the grant-in-aid philosophy, like the Smith-Lever Act. Of course, Senator O'Mahoney, this Secretary of Agriculture is in charge of the Extension; it is a part of the Department. But the objective of the House was, as Ogg emphasized, to get a piece of machinery operating in the States quickly. In other words, they were very violently opposed, and we were, to the Secretary of Agriculture's setting up a bureau.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I agree with that.

Mr. O'NEAL. You have the old philosophy on the statute books, of the acts since 1862, written into that act.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Sure.

Mr. O'NEAL. Which has worked. The point I am making is that under the law passed by the House the University of Wyoming and the University of California, through the Extension Service in the States, could go ahead there and work out a program for Mexican labor there, under the act as passed by the House.

Senator O'MAHONEY. And the point is, as Senator Hayden clearly pointed out awhile ago, that this is not a problem which can be handled by the States alone. There is a Federal phase to this problem.

Mr. O'NEAL. Oh, sure. The Extension Service has that.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The Extension Service in Wyoming cannot do a single thing with respect to the transportation in interstate commerce of agricultural workers. That has to be performed by a Federal agency. And under the bill which you bring to us, that power is granted to a subordinate of the Secretary of Agriculture; but at the same time you say the Secretary shall not be permitted to have anything to do about it.

I think the language which Senator Holman has written down here would get everything you want, because it would prevent the use of these funds for the establishment of any new agency and yet not introduce this row between this subordinate and his chief.

Mr. OGG. Senator Hayden objected to that language on this score, that it would centralize completely the movement of all interstate labor in the Extension office. I want to call to your attention that the language of the bill as passed contains this passage, which fully recognizes the Secretary of Agriculture. It says this $26,000,000 is [reading]—

to be expended under the supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the

agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States on the basis of existing cooperative agreements between the Department and the land-grant colleges as to the conduct of extension work.

Those are cooperative agreements which, it is my understanding, do respect the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture. But the difficulty is that the States of Wyoming and California and Georgia would have nothing to do or say about this. Under the terms of this bill, he has to call in your extension director when he writes your agreement, and sits down with the Employment Service to recruit this imported labor, under the terms of the bill as it passed the House. He has to call the extension director in to write this agreement. And that is why we feel this language is very vital.

(Mr. Ogg subsequently submitted the following for the record:)

QUOTATIONS FROM THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY AND THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE REGARDING EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

* * * with a view of securing economy and efficiency in the conduct of extension work in the State of New York, the president of Cornell University, acting subject to the approval of the Agricultural College Council and the board of trustees of said university, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States hereby make the following memorandum of understanding with reference to cooperative relations between said university and the United States Department of Agriculture in the organization and conduct of extension work in agriculture and home economics by the State College of Agriculture in the State of New York.

III. Cornell University and the United States Department of Agriculture mutually agree:

(1) That the aforesaid cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics in the State of New York involving the use of direct congressional appropriations to the Department of Agriculture shall be planned under the joint supervision of the dean and director of the New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University and the officer in charge of extension work of the United States Department of Agriculture * * *, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture or his duly authorized representatives.

(2) That all appointees for cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics in the State of New York, under this memorandum and subsequent project agreements involving the use of direct congressional appropriations to the Department of Agriculture, shall be joint representatives of the New York State College of Agriculture and the United States Department of Agriculture, unless otherwise expressly provided in the project agreements.

(3) That the cooperation as aforesaid shall be plainly set forth in all publications or other printed matter issued and used in connection with said cooperative extension work by either the New York State College of Agriculture or the United States Department of Agriculture.

(4) That the plans for the use of the Smith-Lever fund shall be made by the dean and director of the State College of Agriculture but shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the terms of the Smith-Lever Act, and when so approved shall be executed by the dean and director of said college.

(5) That the headquarters of the State organization contemplated in this memorandum shall be at the New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

* * * * * * *

This memorandum shall take effect when approved by the president of Cornell University and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and shall remain in force until it is expressly abrogated in writing by either one of the signers or their successors in office.

J. G. SCHURMAN,
President of Cornell University.

AUGUST 29, 1914.

CARL VROOMAN,
Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1914.

Mr. TEAGUE. What if the Extension Service men in the various States don't agree?

Mr. OGG. If you can't get them to agree, I don't believe your program is going to be very successful anyway.

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Teague, you said at the outset of your remarks you had conferred with some gentlemen of broad experience in these matters, to get some estimates of cost?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. The Budget estimate was $65,000,000, and this bill is $26,000,000, as you know.

Mr. TEGUE. Yes, sir; I have here an estimate which I explained to you was an estimate of the need of the importation of 50,000 men, approximately, into California. I didn't feel authorized to go any further than that, because I hadn't conferred with the other States. I see no reason why this plan could not be taken as a Federal plan and expanded to meet the needs of the others, as far as the other States are willing to accept the conditions which we are willing to work under. We don't want delays here. We don't want to wait until this squabble of whether the border is opened up is settled. That may be months. We don't want to wait until a new contract is negotiated with Mexico. That may be months.

We have some expressions from the State Department that they doubt whether the master contract can be renegotiated. Mr. O'Neal has conferred with the State Department since we have. He may have some different idea about it. We think it is very desirable to negotiate as favorable arrangements as you can.

Now, I have this plan here; and with Mr. O'Neal's permission——

Mr. O'NEAL. You go ahead and do it.

Mr. TEAGUE. All right. In this plan I have the personal records of these gentlemen proposed to be appointed.

Senator HAYDEN. I don't think that is essential, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. TEAGUE. Don't you want to know the right men are selected to do this job?

Senator HOLMAN. I suggest they be filed for the record. But what I am waiting to hear you say is the approximate sum total of costs or appropriations required.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes, sir. But, Senator, you are interested in knowing that I am not proposing a political set-up here, aren't you?

Senator HOLMAN. Well, I wouldn't even talk about it.

Mr. TEAGUE. I want you to know that. I have no thought of politics.

Senator HOLMAN. And, strange as it may seem to you, some of us Senators haven't, and are trying to serve our country.

Mr. TEAGUE. Well, I believe that is so, and I hope it is so.

PER CAPITA COST OF BRINGING MEXICAN LABOR INTO CALIFORNIA UNDER PROPOSED PLAN

In here is an outline of the plan and in it the cost of recruitment and bringing these men in, and taking care of them, up to the point of housing and feeding them and taking care of them during the period of recruitment, and assembling them and getting them ready to move,

and the railroad transportation, and everything concerned, for a 6-months' period, for the bringing in to California of 48,000 workers, to an average point, which is about Fresno, in California, which is estimated at $2,453,100. The cost per worker is $51.10.

PER CAPITA COST OF BRINGING MEXICAN LABOR INTO CALIFORNIA BY FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The cost given by Mr. Hughes in his testimony in California of bringing in these Mexicans they have brought in, and returning them, was $144. The big part of this job is recruiting them, which is a much bigger job than returning them. Therefore we think that the costs of doing this job can be cut approximately 50 percent.

Senator HAYDEN. The Farm Security Administration costs was what?

Mr. TEAGUE. It was $144, as given by Mr. Hughes.

Senator HOLMAN. Per head?

Mr. TEAGUE. Per head.

As I say again, with Mr. O'Neal's permission—and I wouldn't file it otherwise, until he was satisfied, or at least we were satisfied we had performed our obligations to him, I wouldn't file it; but he said a moment ago it would be all right to file—in here you will find a complete setup of the arrangements that would have to be made to do this job, to implement it and handle it, with complete estimates in detail here.

Senator HOLMAN. May I inquire there, are those estimates based on California alone, or the entire American demand?

Mr. TEAGUE. No; I am talking of California, and not the American demand.

Senator HOLMAN. The entire American demand would be proportionately larger?

Mr. TEAGUE. It would be cheaper along the border, and greater as you get away from the border.

Senator HOLMAN. Sure; but the proportions also would be larger, with the coefficient of numbers.

Mr. TEAGUE. You are speaking of transporting from the border to States along the border, are you?

Senator HOLMAN. I am just trying to expand your California plan to the national plan.

Mr. TEAGUE. In California we have a State of great distances. Some of the other States haven't as great distances, and they have productive areas closer to the border than our productive areas. We were only able to make an estimate, sir, of the cost of transporting and recruiting these laborers to an average point in California.

Senator HOLMAN. I understand that. Would you care to venture a per head cost for the whole American problem, so that we can arrive at some estimate in the way of a round number?

Mr. TEAGUE. No, sir; I have made no estimate. I have no information as to the need of the other States; I have no information as to what the costs would be; and I wouldn't attempt to venture a guess on that, sir.

Senator HOLMAN. I have one more question, if I may ask you this?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes, sir.

84461—43——13

FAMILIES ACCOMPANY IMPORTED LABOR

Senator HOLMAN. At one point in your testimony you referred to these agricultural laborers as men. Do I understand there will be no women or children come in?

Mr. TEAGUE. We have a statement here that families should be permitted to enter. I am of the opinion that families that could be recruited along the border, and where those people could go there with trucks and pick up the family, where there are several workers in the family, you could reduce the cost per head of workers much below this.

Senator HAYDEN. I want to add a word in that respect. When you come to dealing with rationing, the ration tickets are issued to a family.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. If you have an individual worker, he can't get as much food as if his wife and children were drawing rations at the same time. So I think you will find the food problem simplified if you can bring in families. And I think the experience in Arizona is that a man is much more contented if he can have his wife and children with him.

Mr. TEAGUE. I think you are exactly right.

Senator HAYDEN. By and large it is desirable, where possible, to bring in families. And that was the custom, as I say, where they would send a truck to the border and bring them in, and bring in their cooking utensils, too, which is now a very important item when it comes to buying them.

Mr. TEAGUE. And may I say this, Senator, that the properties which I operate have very good housing facilities for families. They are well equipped and good, modern houses. They comply with the immigration and housing laws of California, even under the restrictions as operated in the past. We had families up to the time there was and organized strike that took them out, you see. They had been there for two generations on our property and were happy and satisfied.

It would suit us lots better to bring in families because we are equipped to handle them. We have spent considerable money for facilities to handle the others.

Now may I speak, Senator, on two other points I have in mind?

POINT RATIONING SYSTEM SHOULD BE CHANGED TO PERMIT PROPER FEEDING OF MEXICANS

Senator RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. TEAGUE. And I think the Senator who is so familiar with conditions along the border will recognize this. Under the point-rationing system. I think there should be some changes made that would permit the proper feeding of Mexicans in the same manner to which they are accustomed. They are accustomed to beans as a major part of their diet. They don't want the things you and I want. And certainly there should be some consideration given to that, if we bring in a large number. They are already dissatisfied with it.

USE OF MEXICAN LABOR FOR FOOD PRODUCTION SHOULD BE GIVEN PRIORITY

One other point. Mr. Ray Wiser, the president of the California Farm Bureau Federation, told me he went to the Farm Security Administration, their headquarters in California, and that they advised him they had on file orders for 17,500, I think it was, Mexican nationals; that the guayule project had a priority on the first 7,000. I spoke of that to Secretary Wickard the other day and I told him I thought that was all wrong, that while guayule may assume considerable importance in the future, certainly our big problem is food production, and food production should have the priority, not a product that everybody recognizes we can't get much out of for 3 years at least—and perhaps the war will be over by that time.

Senator HAYDEN. I read in the evening paper, I think, a statement by Mr. Jeffers in which he took that same view, that he thought it more important at the moment to produce food than it was to produce guayule.

Senator HOLMAN. For 3 years hence?

Senator HAYDEN. For 3 years hence; and I had intended to call his office this morning and find out just what the head of the Rubber Administration had done in regard to that. And I suggest you contact him, too, because we may find that very important before we are through with this.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes, sir.

LANGUAGE OF RESOLUTION PERMITS USE OF CALIFORNIA PLAN

Mr. MCDANIEL. May I make just one comment, that, as drawn, this bill, page 4, lines 20 to 23, gives authority to put into operation such a plan as Mr. Teague has in mind. It would supplement the methods and procedure provided in the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. I would like, then, to file with you—again with Mr. O'Neal's permission—this plan, which I want you to understand was set up as a California plan, to be operated by the Federal Government, and not by California, to supply the need of labor that we have. It seems to me perfectly feasible and proper that this same plan should be expanded, and this same personnel should be used, expanded to take care of the other needs, for the bringing in of Mexican labor. I file it with that understanding, so that nobody misunderstands and nobody will gain the impression we are trying to get any advantage on our neighboring States in this matter.

Senator RUSSELL. You may file it with the reporter, and it will be printed in the record.

Mr. TEAGUE. And I will ask Mr. McDaniel if he will have transcribed those quotations from Senator Downey's remarks, and introduce those into the record as a part of my statement.

Senator RUSSELL. All right, sir.

Mr. TEAGUE. I think you have been very patient with us, and we thank you very much.

Senator RUSSELL. You have studied the question, and we are glad to have gotten your views.

Mr. TEAGUE. May I say, before I leave, Senator, that I expect to be in Washington probably all of next week. If I can be of any

further assistance in any way, if you will call on me, I will be glad to do anything I can. I am staying at the Mayflower.

Senator RUSSELL. Thank you very much.

(The plan submitted by Mr. Teague follows:)

PLAN FOR INCORPORATION OF AGRICULTURAL LABOR FROM MEXICO TO CALIFORNIA

PART A. BRIEF OUTLINE OF PLAN

I. United States Department of Agriculture to clear through Department of State an agreement with Mexico to permit establishment of a recruiting area for agricultural workers for the State of California, said area to begin at a northern limit set by Mexico, and to extend to within approximately 100 miles of Mexico City on the south, with headquarters at Guadalajara, Jalisco, second largest city in Mexico, situated in an extensive agricultural area several hundred miles north and west of Mexico City, and being southern terminus of railway extending north through States of Jalisco, Nayarit, Sinaloa, and Sonora to United States border, Nogales, Ariz.

II. United States Department of Agriculture to appoint recruiting staff for this purpose, with authority, independent of any other recruiting set-up, to enter into negotiations and agreements through proper United States and Mexican governmental agencies, as to quotas, terms of contract, areas to be recruited from and other conditions required to be agreed upon.

III. United States Department of Agriculture to arrange with United States Department of State for necessary counsel and legal work incident to agreements with Mexican Government.

IV. United States Department of Agriculture to arrange with United States Immigration Service and with United States Public Health Service to provide examination and certification of workers at point of origin in Mexico.

V. United States Department of Agriculture to allot funds, under budget plan attached, for expenses incident to importation of this labor.

VI. United States Department of Agriculture to provide food and housing in California labor distributions centers and to arrange employment with farmer groups or individual farmers as needed; importing agency to deliver workers at locations designated by California's distributing agency.

PART B. DETAILED OUTLINE OF PLAN

I. *Reasons for choosing new recruiting area.*—(*a*) Region from Arizona-Sonora border down west coast is essentially rural, largely agricultural. We would not by choice recruit agricultural workers from New York City—same reasoning applies to Mexico City.

(*b*) Southern Pacific of Mexico Railway traverses area Nogales, Ariz., to Guadalajara along coast and across mountains for some 2,000 miles; labor could be drawn from mountains and coastal-plain along this route.

(*c*) Another railway and various highways extend east and south from Guadalajara; these can be used for transporting labor.

(*d*) The region of Guadalajara has over 5,000 feet elevation, a good climate; the people are notably healthy, intelligent, and friendly.

(*e*) No conflict with existing United States-Mexican set-up for recruiting in Mexico City area. Mexico City set-up to have no authority regarding quotas or any matters relating to the new recruiting area.

II. *Creation of California section, Agricultural Labor Administration, and definition of its functions.*—United States Department of Agriculture to name a staff with some such designation as "California section. Agricultural Labor Administration of United States Department of Agriculture" to be composed of two independent units;

(*a*) California housing and distribution unit for feeding, housing, and distribution of Mexican farm labor in California; this unit to have exclusive authority in its work, either (1) taking over duties of Farm Security Administration in California relative to labor already imported, or (2) to place such labor in one concentrated area in order to avoid overlapping functions and authority.

(*b*) Mexican labor importation unit for recruiting and transporting farm labor from Mexico to California, said unit to have authority to negotiate through United States Department of State, independently of any existing recruiting set-up, as to quotas, terms of contract, definition of recruiting areas, agreement on numbers to be recruited from given localities according to population or for special reasons, and assignment of necessary Mexican officials to new recruiting area to (1) establish with State and local authorities the fact of permission for recruiting (2) to issue to workers proper credentials for emigration from Mexico. Permission should be secured by United States Department of Agriculture for use of United States Department of State legal counsel (Embassy, Mexico City) in negotiating labor-employer contract form and possible other legal matters.

Arrangements to be made by United States Department of Agriculture for sending of United States Public Health Service and United States Immigration officials to point of origin in Mexico for examination and certification of workers.

III. *General plan for recruiting Mexican agricultural labor, based on proposal to import 8,000 workers per month for 6 months.*—(*a*) Establish recruiting headquarters at Guadalajara for administration of recruiting, examination, certification, transportation, feed and incidental care of workers, relations with government, and general accounting. Administrative personnel to include administrator, 2 associate administrators, 4 regional or State administrators, manager of transportation and provisioning, chief accounting or disbursing officer, and assistants and office employees as shown in budget.

Working out from Guadalajara with this starting personnel, field men to be added and state regional offices set up as the recruiting area is expanded to Nayarit, Colima, Guanajuato, and other states as found necessary and as permitted by Mexican Government.

Except for administrative staff above-mentioned, most of employees to be Mexicans, particularly field recruiting personnel, which will be assigned certain territory each, visiting villages and rural areas, and scheduling time for workers to appear at certain centers for examination by United States Public Health Service and securing of passports from Mexican officials and United States immigration officials, preliminary to being transported to California.

Qualifications of all employees, with possible exception of some accounting and disbursing, should include knowledge of Spanish language and Mexican people, and more Mexican employees insures better cooperation from them, as well as conserving our manpower and reducing cost of recruiting.

Part C. ESTIMATED MONTHLY BUDGET SHOWING PERSONNEL NEEDED, SALARIES, EMPLOYEES' EXPENSES, OFFICE EXPENSES, EXPENSES IN RELATION TO UNITED STATES HEALTH AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES AND MEXICAN EMIGRATION SERVICE, TRANSPORTATION, FOOD, INCIDENTAL EXPENSES, HEADQUARTERS STAFF GUADALAJARA

Salaries:				
Administrator	$400			
Subadministrator	400			
Do	400			
Expenses:				
Hotel and board for each, at $150 per month	450			
Travel and miscellaneous maximum of $500 per month each	1,500			
		$3,150		
Administrator will have charge of entire recruiting and transportation program, subadministrator to assist actively in field of expediting recruiting and otherwise as needed:				
Transportation manager	$400			
Assistant transportation manager (in charge of provisioning)	250			
Hotel and meals, $150 each	300			
Travel expense (if no passes secured), $400 each	800			
8 transportation assistants to accompany trainloads to United States, at $200 each	1,600			
Meals and travel expenses, at $300 each	2,400			
		[1] 5,750		
Transportation manager should be a man with knowledge of railroad operations, and should know Spanish. Probably could find a former American official of Southern Pacific in Mexico; all American officials were barred from working in Mexico on this railway some years ago.				
Chief accountant or disbursing officer:				
Salary	$350			
Expenses (hotel and board)	150			
Travel and miscellaneous	300			
		800		
4 accounting assistants:				
Salaries, $250 each	1,000			
Expenses (hotel and board)	600			
Travel and miscellaneous expense	500			
		2,100		
4 general office employees (particularly to assist in writing contracts and other details of recruiting in headquarters area):				
Salary, $100 each	$400			
Travel and per diem for 3 of these employees, trips to local recruiting centers	300			
		700		
Office rental and janitor	100			
Office expense—telephone messages, telegrams, stationery, local transportation, etc	500			
		600		
			$13,100	
Regional or State offices:				
Regional director:				
Salary	300			
Expenses (hotel and meals)	150			
Travel, etc	300			
3 regional assistants or recruiting agents, at $100	300			
Expenses, $200 each	600			
Office employee	75			
Office expenses	25			
Office rental	50			
Regional expense	300			
Total	2,100			
4 Regional offices, at $2,100			8,400	
Cost per month			21,500	
For 6 months' period				$129,000
Expenses of other officials:				
If U. S. Health Service officials check 6 men per hour, 50 per day, 1,250 per 25-day month, 7 such officials would be needed to check 8,000 men per month.				
Assuming that U. S. Department of Agriculture pays only hotel, meals, and travel expense, of $300 per month each, cost would be $2,100 monthly; for 6 months		$12,600		

[1] The item of $5,750 not actually a headquarters office expense, as these men are traveling under orders of transportation manager.

Expenses of other officials.—Continued.			
7 officials from U. S. Immigration Service to work in conjunction with Health Service at point of origin with same expense	$12,600		
NOTE.—There is no estimate here for salaries for U. S. Immigration or U. S. Public Health officials; these should be added if to be paid by U. S. Department of Agriculture.			
We cannot expect the Mexican Government to furnish for our purposes officials free of cost, therefore estimate their cost as follows:			
7 Mexican officials at $200 per month	$1,400		
Expenses (hotel and travel), $250 each	1,750		
Total	3,150		
6 months, at $3,150		$18,900	
Other officials total expenses for 6 months			$44,100
All staff salaries, living and travel expenses, office rental and expense, and expenses for U. S. Public Health, U. S. Immigration, and Mexican Emigration officials total for 6 months period ($129,000 plus $42,000)			173,100
1 month's cost would be $28,850, so that total recruiting cost per man figures less than $3.65, including cost of personnel in charge of labor to destination in California.			
Transportation and food expenses (8,000 men per month):			
5 days' food and lodging while transporting to railway and holding to complete trainloads at $1 per day per man recruited, per month		40,000	
Transportation to railway average cost of $2.50 per man recruited		20,000	
Transportation and meals of 8,000 men per month by train, Guadalajara to California, at $40 each		320,000	
Rate—fare and meals, Guadalajara to central California, $37.50; rate—fare and meals, Guadalajara to Mexico City to central California, $47.50; therefore average is figured at $40 each.			
SUMMARY OF BUDGET			
Per month, administration		28,850	
Food and lodging from point of origin until boarding trains		40,000	
Transportation, point of origin to railways		20,000	
Train transportation and meals (subject to correction)		320,000	
Total cost per month		408,850	
For 6 months' period to import 48,000 workers			2,453,100
Cost per worker			51.10

The budget as set up must necessarily be an estimate of personnel needed and expenses to be incurred. Within the total figure of the budget the administrator should be permitted to eliminate, change, or add to employees listed, or to amounts for salaries and other recruiting expenses, as the situation may require.

To the extent that housing is available or can be provided it would be desirable to import families of workers.

These families would in most cases provide board for many single men imported, and would provide additional workers, particularly for harvest periods.

This budget does not include provision for importation of families. If it decided that families are to be imported, this could be done within the limitations of the budget by reducing total men imported, or could be done by adding to the budget.

If appointed to administer the project of recruiting and transporting agricultural workers as outlined I would expect to appoint two assistant administrators, Mr. Clifford F. Burr and Mr. Ross L. Page, whose qualifications I am listing below.

In the whole recruiting organization I would expect to employ only about 14 Americans, the administrator, 2 assistant administrators, transportation manager and assistant, chief disbursing officer and 4 assistants, and 4 State or regional administrators.

Particularly because in a project of this nature it will be impossible to use a system of vouchers so complete as in this country, I would like for the Department of Agriculture to select the chief accountant or disbursing officer,

as he may be termed, taking into account that he should have some knowledge of Spanish if such person is available.

For recruiting employees and office personnel I would select Mexicans as they know their language and their people, and their employment will make the whole project more acceptable in the areas to be recruited from as well as to the Mexican Government.

THOMAS A. ROBERTSON.

PERSONAL RECORD OF THOMAS A. ROBERTSON, SIMI, VENTURA COUNTY, CALIF.

Born November 22, 1897, at Los Mochis, Sinaloa, Mexico, of Danish and American parents; is United States citizen by naturalization, June 1930.

Father was field manager for United Sugar Co. for many years; later retired to farming.

Attended private school in Mexico, and 3½ years Santa Ana High School, Santa Ana, Calif., 850 enrollment, graduating with 4½ years credits. Was president student body, business manager of school paper, debating team, basketball team.

Returned to Mexico, married January 1919, farmed for 6 years in partnership with father, developing sugarcane, alfalfa, and vegetable property of 1,100 acres.

Director and vice president of Union Agricola del Rio Fuerte, director Liga Agricola Occidental Mexicana, agricultural cooperatives.

Carried on business correspondence and accounting in Spanish. Learned Spanish together with English; can use either equally freely.

Served on tax committees representing colonists and native farmers in state capitol on various occasions.

Sold Mexican properties in 1925, purchasing Sinaloa ranch, 512 acres, Simi, Calif. Is one-half owner, wife one-fourth owner, father one-fourth owner. Ranch consists of 280 acres Valencia oranges, 50 acres Concord grapes, 50 acres walnuts, balance open land; appraised by Federal land bank county secretary upwards of $500,000.

BUSINESS AND PUBLIC EXPERIENCE

Director, Tapo Citrus Association.
President, Ventura County Vegetable Growers Association.
Chairman, vegetable department, California Farm Bureau Federation.
Chairman, Concord Grape Proration Zone No. 1, California.
Chairman, Tomato Proration Zone No. 1, California.
Member, California Agricultural Prorate Commission.
Chairman, National Canning Crops Conference, American Farm Bureau Federation.
Chairman, resolutions committee, National Fruit and Vegetable Conference, American Farm Bureau Federation.
Chairman, resolutions committee, National Vegetable Growers Conference of United States Department of Agriculture at Washington 1938.
Member, executive committee, National Vegetable Committee of United States Department of Agriculture, 1938–39.
Vice President, American National Cooperative Exchange, shipping 30,000 to 40,000 cars fruits and vegetables annually.

Retired from numerous activities in 1938 due to nervous strain.

Kept contact with Mexico and Mexicans through trips, usually one each year, to Mexico.

Has employed in Mexico up to 200, in California up to 300 Mexicans.

PERSONNEL RECORD OF CLIFFORD F. BURR, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

(Proposed to be employed by United States Department of Agriculture as subadministrator in importation of Mexican agricultural workers)

Born: January 21, 1894.
Place: Los Mochis, Sinaloa, Mexico.
I am a citizen of the United States (both my parents were native-born citizens of the United States).
Male: single; height, 5 feet 9 inches; weight, 160 pounds.

No physical defect, disease, or disability. Vision is good with glasses. I see well at a distance without glasses.

I was in the United States naval service during the First World War. Was commissioned as ensign. Received honorable discharge.

Have never been arrested or summoned into court as a defendant.

I am a member of: The American Legion, National Educational Association, Administrators of Adult Education, California.

EDUCATION

Santa Ana High School, Santa Ana, Calif., 1908–11; graduated.

University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif., 1912–16; A. B., Spanish and sociology.

University of Southern California,[1] Los Angeles, Calif., 1916–17; general secondary credentials State of California.

United States Navy (R. F.), Navigation School, San Pedro and Mare Island, Calif., 1918–19; commissioned ensign.

University of Southern California, law school, Los Angeles, Calif., 1919–21.

University of Southern California, summer sessions,[1] Los Angeles, Calif., 1935–38; courses in adult educational methods, curriculum building, vocational guidance, administration.

University of California,[1] extension, Los Angeles, Calif., 1938–40.

I speak Spanish fluently.

Have had much experience leading conference discussion.

Observations on experience in Mexico in addition to that mentioned on the accompanying Form 57. (My experience in Mexico is checked in red on the form for ready reference.)

I was born at Los Mochis, Sinaloa, Mexico. My father was vice president of J. W. Scally & Sons, farming 500 acres of irrigated land.

I learned to speak Spanish and English at the same time. Later in high school and college in the United States I studied Spanish to read and write it correctly.

In addition to the 8 years of paid employment in Mexico, I spent 12 years there at school and helping on the farm.

My uncle, J. P. Scally, was president of the Mochis Agricultural Union, composed of growers, both Mexican and American, of alfalfa, tomatoes, and peppers. As he was completely deaf, I had to assist him in many of his official duties, and often acted in his place in the management of the packing house, in dealings with employees, growers, and Mexican officials.

During the 6 years I was manager of a tomato packing house and of farming operations for J. W. Scally & Sons, I exercised close supervision of the employees, all Mexican, varying from 25 to 125 in number at the peak of the picking season. While I had foremen helping me, I found that better results were secured when I was in a position to be in close contact with the men, all of whom I knew by name. None of my men ever went on strike.

On account of my ability to speak Spanish and to get along with the Mexicans well, I was usually made a member of the numerous committees named to represent the growers in conferences with Mexican officials, including members of the State legislature, the Governor, and Presidents Obregon, Calles, and Cardenas.

For several years I was a member of the board of governors of the Los Mochis Country Club, and my last year there I was president.

For the past 6 years I have owned a 10-acre farm, part in oranges, at La Habra, Calif., which has afforded me considerable California farming experience.

SUMMARY OF RECORD OF EMPLOYMENT IN CALIFORNIA SINCE 1934

August 1934 to December 1939: Technical supervisor, adult education, State department of education.

December 1939 to May 1942: State supervisor, adult education, State department of education.

May 1942 to date: Chief, War Services Section, Service Division, Federal Works Agency; duties, planning and supervising clerical, education, and recreation programs, and making marketing laws surveys in southern California.

[1] Graduate work.

PERSONAL RECORD OF ROSS L. PAGE

Born in 1884 in Kansas, graduate of Kansas Normal University, went to American colony in Sinaloa, Mexico, after graduation, became field manager, then general manager, of United Sugar Co.'s largest sugar-producing unit in Mexico, production about 30,000 acres, employing upward of 5,000 men.

After being in this position about 12 years, took position of assistant general manager for largest sugar interests in Puerto Rico, involving care of major portion of island production.

After about 10 years returned as general manager of United Sugar Co. for period of about 8 years, then retired.

Salary range has been up to $20,000 per year.

Now resides part time in San Diego, Calif., part in Sinaloa, Mexico.

Personal friend for 30 years of Thomas A. Robertson.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

PROVISO REQUIRING CONSENT OF COUNTY AGENTS AND STATE COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE FOR MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I haven't had an opportunity since this was called to our attention to take the matter up with our Connecticut Senators; but I understand this is the last hearing you will have, and I did want to call attention to this particular proviso written in on the floor of the House, on page 4, at line 7, the proviso added [reading]:

> That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent—

And so forth.

EFFECT OF PROVISO ON USE OF INTERSTATE FARM LABOR BY TOBACCO GROWERS IN CONNECTICUT

Two years ago the tobacco growers of Connecticut brought in quite a few colored college students from the South, and brought their instructors up with them, more or less as an experiment, and it worked out very satisfactorily. Last year, they increased that number considerably, and this year they hope to increase it still further. They came into the community where quarters were provided for them, and a certain amount of recreation. And with their instructors there, there was no trouble at all in the community.

The tobacco growers up there, in reading this proviso put in, feared it would prevent them grom getting these college students if some particular county agent saw fit to block the move. The students come to these southern schools from various parts of the South, and to get the county agents of their home communities to approve their going to Connecticut would be a difficult task, and the county agent where the college is located might not feel sufficiently familiar with the situation to grant his approval.

So we fear this proviso may prevent bringing up at their own expense these students, and we wanted to call that to the attention of the committee. We will later call it to the attention of our Connecticut Senator so that he can perhaps talk to the committee on

that. But for fear the hearing would be closed, I wanted to get that thought before the committee, with the hope that some way could be worked out by which those who wanted to transport workers could do so without this restriction.

I have no objection to the restriction as far as the Federal Government is going to transport workers, and as to that they could write the rules.

Thank you very much.

STATEMENTS OF DR. JOSHUA BERNHARDT, CHIEF, SUGAR BRANCH, FOOD DISTRIBUTION ADMINISTRATION; WAYNE DARROW, ADMINISTRATOR, FARM LABOR ADMINISTRATION; AND R. W. MAYCOCK, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Senator O'MAHONEY. Mr. Chairman, I requested Dr. Bernhardt to come here, with Mr. Darrow, because, as the head of the Sugar Section of the Department of Agriculture, he has been very intimately connected with this problem of procuring and distributing labor for the beet sugar industry, and I have felt that a statement from him would be of great importance in connection with the bill.

All right, Doctor.

IMPORTANCE OF BEET SUGAR SUPPLY

Dr. BERNHARDT. Thank you, Senator. I would like, if I may, to outline the way in which, at the present time, the beet-sugar supply has come to be of major importance, before we outline the relationship of the provisions in the bill. Because of the submarine campaign last year, the supplies of raw sugar that came into the United States from Cuba and Puerto Rico were of course substantially curtailed. What will happen this year, for the calendar year 1943, is a matter of uncertainty and is bound to be so, as long as there is a prospect of submarine warfare.

PROBABILITY OF SERIOUS DECLINE IN BEET SUGAR ACREAGE

The recent statement of the Department of Agriculture on plantings for 1943, the so-called "intention to plant" report, shows that notwithstanding the very intensive effort made to maintain the beet acreage, there is a probability of serious decline. At the present time the crop report indicates an acreage which is approximately 70½ percent of last year.

LABOR SUPPLY SITUATION IN BEET SUGAR AREA

The main difficulty in the maintaining of the beet acreage today is the labor supply situation. The farmers had such a harrowing experience in the past year, particularly on the Pacific coast, that they hesitate to plant beets if there is any other crop they could plant in preference.

The supply situation being as it is, and our dependence upon the beet sugar crop being as it is during this period, we are greatly concerned lest any further action be taken which might further curtail the beet crop. Last year it was necessary to move beet sugar from the west-

ern areas with sparse population where the crop is produced, to as far east as the New England States, with the Government absorbing certain costs of excess transportation. Without that arrangement and without that movement, the eastern beet consuming centers of the United States at certain times of the year would have been in a very serious situation.

The importance of sugar is indicated, both to farmers generally and industrial communities as well, by a few facts that we have now obtained as a result of rationing, which I would like, if I may, to call to your attention.

SUGAR NEEDED FOR CANNING OF FRUITS

Senator HOLMAN. I would like to comment right there that housewives in the West, which is a fruit-producing country, did not put up the stores of fruit as they were accustomed to do. Therefore, they are short of foodstuffs in their pantries, which they were ready and willing to preserve, but the rationing of sugar did not permit them to do so. I would hate to see that duplicated this next year.

Dr. BERNHARDT. Yes, sir. I understand that the Office of Price Administration is now working on a program which they hope will meet that situation.

AMOUNT OF SUGAR USED IN 1941 BY INDUSTRY

The baking industry in 1941 used more than half a million tons of sugar. The processing of canned and preserved fruits was as much as 170,000 tons of sugar. For those areas of the country which are interested in dairy products, the usage was over 125,000 tons of sugar with ice cream included. Even in tobacco, and in meat packing, something like 50,000 tons of sugar is used a year.

Consequently, the prospect that we might have to reduce the industrial ration, now fixed at 70 percent of 1941 usage, for these various industries, many of which process farm products, is a matter of vital concern to all parts of the United States, whether or not they produce sugar beets or sugarcane.

CONSUMPTION OF SUGAR BY SOFT-DRINK INDUSTRIES

In the urban areas there is no community that hasn't a number of bottlers of beverages which consume about a quarter of a million tons of sugar a year. There are some very large soft-drink industrial enterprises which use enormous quantities. For many reasons that do not appear on the surface, it is pretty important not to curtail supplies beyond the present level, if possible.

Now if I may speak off the record for a moment on the war-supply situation.

(A brief discussion off the record followed.)

PROBABLE DECREASE IN SUGAR-BEET ACREAGE

Dr. BERNHARDT. With that background, the situation being as it is, we find the prospect of the beet crop, as reported in the March 19 report, indicating a serious curtailment, although both Congress and

the administration have done what they could in the last 15 months to work out programs that would be satisfactory to the industry.

STEPS TAKEN TO INCREASE SUGAR-BEET ACREAGE

At the close of 1941 Congress amended the Sugar Act so as to provide for increased payments to producers of sugar beets and sugarcane, and recently a departmental program has been worked out, involving the Commodity Credit Corporation participation, that will further improve the returns; so that everything is being done that can be done in that respect. But we are squarely up against this labor problem.

ELIMINATION RECOMMENDED OF PROVISO REQUIRING CONSENT OF COUNTY AGENTS AND STATE COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE IN MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

House Joint Resolution 96 provides, at one point, that before any of the funds in the bill may be used to transport workers, the consent must be obtained, or certification must be obtained, of the local Extension Service official, and, with respect to a State, the consent of the commissioner of agriculture must be obtained. That would mean, in effect, with respect to this industry, which has historically gone elsewhere than in the immediate vicinity to recruit its labor, particularly Mexican labor, that a greater threat than has yet appeared to production would be injected into the picture. In fact, I doubt whether many beet growers would even consider planting any acreage this year if they were confronted with this new difficulty.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You mean your thought is that if that obstacle were allowed to remain, the reduction in plantings would be even greater than that indicated?

Dr. BERNHARDT. The reduction would be even greater than the 30 percent now contemplated, which is of course very serious in itself. And we are trying, between now and the final planting season, to increase the acreage.

Senator O'MAHONEY. So you recommend the elimination of the amendment put in on the floor of the House, requiring the approval of the local and State officials for the transportation of workers?

Dr. BERNHARDT. Yes, sir. We not only want to recommend that it be eliminated, but to stress the seriousness of the situation involved.

(A brief discussion off the record followed.)

PROVISION RELATING TO RENEGOTIATION OF MEXICAN AGREEMENT

Senator O'MAHONEY. Is there any other provision of the bill to which you wish to call attention?

Dr. BERNHARDT. There is only one other provision, and that is the one which relates to the renegotiation of the agreement with the Mexican Government. The beet-sugar folks were here a great part of last year—some representatives of the industry—and they have been here recently. They worked very hard last year with interested governmental agencies to get this job done. I don't know whether they were satisfied with every detail of that agreement; but at least

it worked, and they finally got the labor they required from Mexico under that agreement.

For any such agreement to be renegotiated, a much greater period of time would be required than the industry could possibly visualize, if they are going to produce a crop. And so we certainly would recommend that the provision be so amended as not to limit the use of these funds to the brief period, after which renegotiation must be completed.

Senator RUSSELL. Some of the chief supporters of the bill before the committee today have suggested that that language be relaxed so that the present agreement would not be abrogated during the period of renegotiation.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Does that complete your statement?

Dr. BERNHARDT. That is all I have to say.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Dr. Bernhardt is accompanied by Mr. Darrow and, in view of some of the testimony adduced before this committee, I wonder if it would be well to have Mr. Darrow make a statement as to the way in which he is administering this farm-labor job. It is my understanding Mr. Darrow was named by the Secretary of Agriculture to have charge of this program. Were you not?

Mr. DARROW. Yes, sir.

FORMER EMPLOYMENT WITH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I ask whether you have been associated with the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. DARROW. No, sir.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You are not in the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. DARROW. No, sir.

Senator O'MAHONEY. From what branch of the Department do you come?

Mr. DARROW. I came immediately from the Office of Information, and before that from the triple A. Before that I was with the Extension Service.

Senator O'MAHONEY. So that you are not associated with the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. DARROW. And have never been.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Do you have any Farm Security Administration people in your office?

Mr. DARROW. No, sir.

PROGRAM OF DEPARTMENT FOR HANDLING FARM LABOR PROBLEM

Senator O'MAHONEY. Would you be good enough to tell us of the program, if any, you have had to solve this agricultural labor problem?

Mr. DARROW. Yes, Senator; I would be very glad to speak to that point. The Department of Agriculture has a well-planned-out, unified, coordinated plan for meeting the farm-labor situation this year, much of it under way, all of it discussed with the interested agencies, to operate along the priniciple that you must have in wartime a unified, centrally directed effort; and, second, that you must take full advantage of local initiative, that you must encourage local organizations to do their utmost, and help them keep from stumbling over each other in their efforts to help solve the labor problem.

Those, I think, are the cardinal principles in solving the labor difficulties of this year of 1943. And our program, as planned out, part of it under way, and the rest of it ready to go, has that in mind.

INTENTION TO UTILIZE AND TO COOPERATE WITH STATE AND COUNTY ORGANIZATIONS

I want to stress especially the local angles, the local initiative. We do not want to tear up what already exists out there. For instance, every State or nearly every State has a State farm-labor committee of some sort. Sometimes it is set up by the State government or the governor. Sometimes it is a continuation of the old labor committee set up by the planning people. But in some form or another, in just about every State, and in nearly all the counties, you find some kind of a labor committee. We want to use that as the nucleus and to use that as the balance wheel, the consulting group of citizens for the Government agencies who are working on the labor program, and I think that is cardinal in this whole thing. We propose to work along those lines, and through that means to get the fullest cooperation out of State and county organizations, both in and out of Government.

PROGRAM HANDLED THROUGH AGRICULTURAL LABOR ADMINISTRATION

Senator O'MAHONEY. Are you establishing a new bureau?

Mr. DARROW. No; not in the sense you speak of a bureau, not in the sense of a line agency. I want to keep this Agricultural Labor Administration as small as possible, to be a guiding, centralizing, directing force, to help the rest of them, and to go no further than is absolutely necessary to help these agencies in and out of Government to get the job done.

PROGRAM NOT REGARDED AS A SOCIAL SERVICE ENTERPRISE

Senator O'MAHONEY. Do you regard it as a social-service enterprise?

Mr. DARROW. No; I regard the job ahead of me as just one thing: to get the labor on the farms that is needed.

WORK DONE TO DATE INCLUDING MOVEMENT OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR

Senator O'MAHONEY. What have you done to date?

Mr. DARROW. To date we have been breaking log jams. As concerns the Mexican situation, we have succeeded in getting recruitment going down there and getting the trainloads moving out of Mexico City into Arizona and California. The first one left Monday night; another one is due to leave today; and the third one is due to leave next Monday.

IMPORTATION OF FARM LABOR FROM ACROSS MEXICAN BORDER

Senator McCARRAN. The information coming before this committee in the last few days indicates there may be and probably are several thousand workers at the border, in Mexico, anxious to come into the United States, and that that situation does prevail in certain

harvest and planting seasons. The question has been raised as to why these border workers should not be permitted to come over, instead of recruiting inexperienced workers from central Mexico. You have just mentioned your first train left Mexico City, and another one coming up. Would it not be more economic and more easy to recruit the workers from the border?

Mr. DARROW. It would, if the Mexican Government would permit it.

Senator McCARRAN. Then it is an economic matter with them, is it?

Mr. DARROW. It is.

Senator McCARRAN. In other words, you take too much labor from certain districts and leave them barren of labor?

Mr. DARROW. They have their national plans, their national economy. And under the agreement they permit us to recruit only in the points they designate. They have been unwilling to designate any points in the northern provinces.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Have you sought to have them designate such points?

Mr. DARROW. Yes, sir; and we are now working on it through the State Department.

Senator McCARRAN. The trouble with that system is that you are getting workers from central Mexico and around Mexico City with no farm training, who probably know little or nothing about the crops they are about to go into.

Mr. DARROW. That is true, although our reports indicate that the workers recruited down there right now look pretty good. We have a party, including at least one grower from California, down there recruiting now. The last report I had was that there were 5,000 applicants, and the rejects are running rather high. But we have more Mexicans ready to come than we can yet get transportation for.

QUESTION AS TO WHETHER MEXICAN GOVERNMENT IMPOSES ANY RESTRICTIONS AS TO NUMBER OF FARM LABORERS COMING TO UNITED STATES

Senator O'MAHONEY. Does the Mexican Government impose any restriction on the number coming up?

Mr. DARROW. The terms of the agreement I believe, limit it to 50,000. We have 23,000 orders right now for workers for California and Arizona.

NUMBER OF MEXICAN LABORERS NOW IN TRANSIT

Senator O'MAHONEY. On this train that left Mexico City the other day, how many workers were on it?

Mr. DARROW. There were 650.

Senator O'MAHONEY. How many are altogether now on the journey?

Mr. DARROW. When the train leaves today, it will be a total of 650 plus 750—1,400. The problem right now is one of transportation. We are working intensively on that.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I gather now we have received or are in process of receiving about 25,000 altogether?

Mr. DARROW. We hope to get them out.

Senator O'MAHONEY. And that would leave a balance of 25,000 available under the agreement?

Mr. DARROW. Yes, sir.

Senator O'MAHONEY. What prospect is there of your getting those?

Mr. DARROW. I think the prospect of getting them is good, if we can get the transportation, except for House Joint Resolution 96. I think that would prevent the bringing in of any Mexican or any other foreign labor.

DATE OF APPOINTMENT OF WAYNE DARROW

Senator RUSSELL. When were you appointed to assume the responsibility of this job?

Mr. DARROW. March 1.

Senator RUSSELL. You are new on this job, then?

Mr. DARROW. Yes, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. You can't claim any of the sins or aren't responsible for the sins last year that have been brought to the attention of this committee?

Mr. DARROW. No, sir. I am fresh on the job March 1, and I have worked every day, including Sundays, from then until now. It is my absorbing interest in life, and I can assure you in those 25 or 26 days I have learned more than I have learned in any other similar period in my life.

REASON LEGISLATION IS NEEDED AT THIS TIME

Senator HOLMAN. You are getting some results without legislation. In other words, within 2 or 3 weeks after taking the job, you have gotten 1,400 people in transit, and you expect if transportation facilities were available you would keep the flow going on?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Senator HOLMAN. Then why do you need more legislation on the subject?

Mr. DARROW. Funds, in the first place. I am operating with borrowed help.

Senator HOLMAN. That might be a good idea. That may be the utilization of people from overstaffed departments.

Mr. DARROW. There is a very great shortage of people in the Department of Agriculture, I assure you of that.

Senator HOLMAN. We won't go into that. Let us come back to this legislation.

IMPORTATION FROM BAHAMA ISLANDS

Mr. DARROW. I have two shortages—men to get this job done, and the big farm labor shortage. May I say, coming back to your question about the Bahaman agreement, we have succeeded in negotiating an agreement with the Government of the Bahamas, and are bringing over as many of those workers as we can right away. The recruiting party is getting into Nassau today. We are bringing them in for the Florida late bean crop.

POSSIBILITY OF GETTING LABOR FROM VIRGIN ISLANDS

Senator McCarran. What is the possibility of recruiting farm labor out of the Virgin Islands?

Mr. Darrow. We are investigating that, too. We are investigating the possibilities of workers throughout the Caribbean area.

REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED UPON INDIVIDUAL FARM EMPLOYER

Senator O'Mahoney. Do you impose any requirements upon the individual farmer employer, beyond those which are embraced in the basic agreements?

Mr. Darrow. No, sir. All of the contracts for migratory labor cover what seem to me two very essential things that must be looked after in a tight labor market if you want to get labor. And that is you must assure people, when you move them, what pay they are going to get; and, second, you have to tell them what kind of living quarters they are going to have, if any. Those are basic in any of these agreements. When you get foreign agreements, the foreign governments always insist on certain things, those and some other points.

Does that answer your question, Senator?

Senator O'Mahoney. There has been a great deal of complaint to this committee and to the same committee in the House, that the Farm Security Administration in the past has imposed requirements which have been at least annoying to farmer employers and have tended to indicate that the agency was more concerned in effecting some kind of social reform than in getting labor to do the work.

Mr. Darrow. Well, I am concerned in getting the labor in, and I am concerned with the fact that you have to have a contract.

Senator McCarran. That is, a contract with the employer?

Mr. Darrow. With the employer, and the contract has to be within the limits of the agreement with the foreign government. The contract can vary, as long as you observe the points in the agreement.

Senator O'Mahoney. Of course, you have satisfied the worker, or else he won't come, if he is a free agent. He has to be satisfied that the conditions under which he will work and the pay he is going to get are such that he is willing to accept?

Mr. Darrow. Yes, sir.

Senator O'Mahoney. My point is, do you impose anything beyond what the worker wants?

Mr. Darrow. No.

CONTRACT BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND THE GROWER

Senator McCarran. What is that contract you mentioned?

Mr. Darrow. The contract between the government and the grower, the one which has been so much discussed.

Senator McCarran. That seems to be a stumbling block, too, and I have considerable criticism about that.

CHANGES IN NEW CONTRACT WORKED OUT

Mr. Darrow. Yes, sir. We have worked out a new contract, or an adapted contract, a contract which I think overcomes most of the objections of last year.

Senator McCarran. How about a bond?

Mr. Darrow. And it could be adjusted still further, as long as you don't violate the agreement between the two countries. The bond has been waived for this year, and so has the $5 charge per worker. The difficulty, though, on that, Senator, is that so far the lawyers say we cannot make that retroactive. And I think—and I won't give the exact figure because I don't know it—perhaps there were as many as 10,000 who had signed up and put up their $5 and their bonds; and they are, I am sure, wanting to get their money back. Right now our legal people say you can't do it. I am moving ahead to get labor in, and we will try to take care of that one later.

FIVE DOLLAR HEAD FEE ELIMINATED

Senator Russell. You have eliminated the $5 per head charge?

Mr. Darrow. Yes, sir.

Mr. Maycock. I want to make sure, Mr. Chairman, that the $5 charge per worker is understood. It was only in the interest of economical operation of this program, and in an effort not to have the transportation program cost the Government any more than necessary, that the charge was imposed. In other words, in carrying out this program, at least until very recently, we have not paid the transportation of workers recruited within a distance of 200 miles.

Senator O'Mahoney. Who paid that transportation?

Mr. Maycock. The worker either got himself there, or the employer paid that transportation. When we employ from distances greater than 200 miles, which has usually been from outside of the State and from Mexico, we do pay the transportation and pay it right up to the point of destination. The $5 was imposed upon the employer as an amount to cover the last 200 miles. It was an effort to treat everyone fairly and to save the Government money. We were basing it on the principle that in immediate local recruitment the Government should not have to bear the cost.

Senator Russell. It equalized the expense of the farmers in different areas?

Mr. Maycock. That is right.

Senator O'Mahoney. The statement was made this morning that the purpose of the charge was to prevent individual small farmers from obtaining any labor and to require negotiations to be made with organizations.

Mr. Maycock. I can't see how it would work that way or have that effect, Senator O'Mahoney. Now the bond was required, as I understand it, in order that the farmers wouldn't get overly ambitious and ask for more workers than they would actually need, and in an effort, therefore, to see that the Government would not expend money and overdo this job and get workers who were not needed. These were a couple of safeguards that were taken, all in the interest, I think, of economy and of efficient operation on the part of the Government—but misunderstood by others.

NUMBER OF FARM WORKERS MOVED INTERSTATE

Senator O'Mahoney. To what extent have you succeeded in moving workers from State to State, not from Mexico or the Bahamas, but from State to State within the United States.

Mr. DARROW. None have been moved on the migratory labor program since I have been in, except for the training of farmers from less productive areas for full-time, experienced farm jobs in the dairy States.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Do you know whether the Farm Security Administration has procured any workers of that character?

Mr. DARROW. No migratory workers have been, since March 1, to my knowledge, recruited and moved by the Farm Security Administration. But they have, on this very important program of training underworked farmers for work on complex livestock, dairy, poultry farms, moved something like two or three thousand to date. And we hope that by July 1 the number will be up to 25,000 and by the end of the year to 50,000. It is one of the most critical parts of the whole food-production program, the need for experienced farm hands. But that is a different thing from this other we are talking about, of the migratory workers.

Senator O'MAHONEY. There is a table in the House hearings, at pages 20 and 21, which indicates a total of 12,102 domestic and Mexican workers had been transported from the inception of the program to February 18. Do you know whether there has been a break-down of that, as to how many domestic and how many Mexican?

Mr. MAYCOCK. Approximately 5,000 Mexican and 7,000 domestic, Senator.

Mr. DARROW. Bear in mind I was answering the question for the period since March 1. I am familiar with this, too. This was done last fall and winter. The recruiting and transporting of Mexicans stopped early in February, I believe, because the Mexican Government did not wish to go further with it at that time, and it was resumed a week ago Tuesday.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL SHEEPHERDERS

Senator McCARRAN. I take it, this is entirely aside from the question and probably outside the sphere of your jurisdiction now. But just for a matter of inquiry, has anything been done, to your knowledge, toward gathering other lines of agricultural labor? The reason I ask that question is this. Those of us who come from the intermountain country are very much interested in sheep raising, in which we have been terribly handicapped in the way of getting herders. We used to get our herders from the Pyrenees, and the French and Spanish Basques, and are unable to get them now, and many of our larger herders have folded up because of that. I am wondering if that has come to your attention.

Mr. DARROW. Yes, sir.

Senator McCARRAN. Is there anything that could be done?

Mr. DARROW. To a limited extent I believe Mexicans, if they can serve in that work, can be brought over. They are classed as nomadic workers—and I am not quite sure of the definition there—but at least they come within the 50,000 we hope to get from Mexico. For instance, we succeeded in getting 10 Mexican cowboys over for 1 ranch recently.

Senator McCARRAN. There is no way of getting some from Europe, from Spain or France?

QUESTION AS TO LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF WORKERS FOR IMPORTATION FROM MEXICO

Mr. DARROW. We have been looking all around at these foreign sources, but we haven't looked that far yet.

(A brief discussion followed, off the record.)

Senator RUSSELL. Where do you get this figure of 50,000? Is that a limit the Mexican Government proposed?

Mr. DARROW. That was in the agreement with Mexico, last year, I believe.

Senator RUSSELL. No; there is no number in there. It says (reading):

As it is impossible to determine at this time the number of workers who may be needed in the United States for agricultural labor employment, the employer shall advise the Mexican Government from time to time as to the number needed. The Government of Mexico shall determine in each case the number of workers who may leave the country without detriment to its national economy.

That is all there is on it, unless the Mexican Government has decided 50,000 was all they would release.

Mr. DARROW. I may be mistaken there. If it isn't in the agreement itself, then it was set by the management-labor committee of the War Manpower Commission, which is an outside committee composed of industry, agriculture, and labor representatives. But after I inherited this whole job, I was informed at the very beginning there was a limit of 50,000 from Mexico.

TEXT OF BAHAMAN LABOR

Senator RUSSELL. It wasn't put in the agreement, unless it has been amended. Do you have the text of this Bahaman agreement? Is it very similar to the Mexican agreement?

Mr. DARROW. It is similar. It varies in minor details. For instance, on the wage provision it says the pay shall be prevailing wages, not less than 30 cents an hour, and there is a provision in there for piecework rate. I consider that very important in any of the contracts, that provision be made for piecework rates.

In my observation there is where a good deal of the trouble came in Arizona last year, Senator, because the 30 cents an hour minimum didn't fit into the cotton-picking economy. I think that has been ironed out in the new contract that has been worked up recently and which we are ready to use this year. So we do have that in the Bahaman agreement.

Senator RUSSELL. If you have a copy of that Bahaman agreement, I would be glad if you would submit it for the record.

Mr. DARROW. I will do so. I don't have it with me.

(The text of the Bahaman agreement follows:)

AGREEMENT FOR THE EMPLOYMENT OF BAHAMIANS IN THE UNITED STATES

THIS AGREEMENT, made this 16th day of March 1943 by and between Fred Morrell, Assistant Director, Agricultural Labor Administration, United States Department of Agriculture acting for and on behalf of the Government of the United States of America and Honorable William Leslie Heape, C. M. G., Colonial Secretary acting for and on behalf of the Government of the Bahama Islands.

WITNESSETH:

For the purpose of making agricultural workers from the Bahamas available for work in the United States of America for the production of food for the winning of the war, the following general provisions are suggested:

1. The Bahamian workers shall not be engaged in or subject to military service by or for the United States Government.

2. Bahamians entering the United States as the result of this understanding shall not suffer discriminatory acts of any kind in accordance with Executive Order No. 8802 issued at the White House June 25, 1941.

3. They shall not be employed to displace other workers or to reduce previously established wage rates.

4. No Bahamian workers shall be employed under this agreement except with the consent of the Bahamas Government.

In order to implement this understanding the following specific clauses are included.

CONTRACTS

1. The United States Government shall contract with each worker and with employers to effect the purpose and principles of this agreement. The contracts shall accord with the applicable authorities of the respective Governments.

2. If the United States Government does not renew its contract with the worker upon the expiration thereof, the United States Government shall, except in case of physical impossibility, return the worker to his place of entry, or such other place of entry as the two Governments may mutually determine, for return to the Bahamas.

ADMISSION

1. The United States health authorities shall supervise the necessary health examinations of the workers to determine whether such workers meet the physical standards requisite for admission to the United States and whether such workers are in physical condition to perform agricultural labor. The Bahamas health authorities shall assist with such facilities for such examinations as may be available.

2. Admission shall accord with the regulations of the United States Government acting through the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice and the Visa Division of the Department of State.

TRANSPORTATION

1. All transportation and living expenses (for the workers and up to 75 pounds of personal belongings per worker) from the workers' places of origin to the places of entry into the United States and return from such places of entry to the workers' places of origin, as well as any expenses incident to the fulfillment of any admission requirements, shall be borne by the Bahamas Government.

2. All transportation and living expenses (for the workers and up to 75 pounds of personal belongings per worker) from the places of entry into the United States to the places of employment and return to the places of entry shall be borne by the United States Government.

WAGES AND EMPLOYMENT

1. The rates for wages to be paid the workers shall meet those prevailing in the particular areas for similar work. Piece-work rates shall be so set as to enable workers of average ability to earn for a fair day's work not less than the prevailing wages. In no event, whether the workers are employed at hourly, piece, or other rates, shall the workers receive less than 30 cents an hour.

2. The workers shall be employed only at agricultural work (including work contributing directly to agriculture, such as carpentry for farm labor housing). Workers may, however, perform other than agricultural work with the consent of the Governments of the United States and the Bahamas.

3. No collection, deduction, or rebate from the workers' wages or allowances shall be made for commissions, fees, or any other purposes whatsoever, except as may be required by law or as may be necessary to pay the workers' bona fide debts to their employers voluntarily incurred.

4. No person under 18 years of age shall be employed under this agreement.

5. Workers shall not be required to purchase goods or services for their personal consumption or use at any sources not of their choice.

6. Living conditions and sanitary and medical services for the workers shall be of the same kinds as those afforded other agricultural workers in the particular areas. Insofar as practicable, workers employed under this agreement shall be housed in camps maintained by the United States Government. Where such camps are not available, workers shall be housed only in quarters approved by the United States Government.

7. The workers shall be afforded the same legal protection as to occupational diseases and accidents as other agricultural workers are afforded under the statutes in force in the particular areas.

8. The workers shall be employed for at least 75 percent of the periods of employment (exclusive of Sundays or one other day in each seven) specified in their contracts with the United States Government. Each worker shall receive a subsistence allowance of $3 for each day upon which he is not so employed within such 75 percent. He shall also receive subsistence during periods of unemployment within the remaining 25 percent upon the same basis as it is made available to other agricultural workers in migratory labor camps or labor supply centers.

PAYMENT OF WAGES AND SAVINGS FUNDS

1. It is desired that the workers shall be paid only a part of their wages and that the remaining part shall be divided between their families and savings funds to be established for the workers by the Bahamas Government. Upon receipt of notice from the Bahamas Government of the parts so to be paid, the United States Government will take action to effectuate such payment and division.

2. The Bahamas Government will assume full responsibility to the workers for sums paid to it or its order for such savings funds.

NUMBERS OF WORKERS

The United States Government shall inform the Bahamas Government from time to time of the numbers of workers needed for employment hereunder in the United States. The Bahamas Government shall then determine in each case the number of workers who may leave the Bahamas and the points within the Bahamas where they may be recruited, and shall inform the American Consul in Nassau. The American Consul will communicate this information through the proper channels to the United States Department of Agriculture.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. There will be full cooperation between the Governments of the United States and the Bahamas and between their respective agencies.

2. It is expected that the terms and conditions of this agreement will apply with reference to Bahamian workers engaged in other than agricultural work in the United States pursuant to arrangements which may hereafter be made between the two Governments.

3. Either Government shall have the right to renounce this agreement by giving notice to the other 90 days in advance.

FRED MORRELL,
Assistant Director, Agricultural Labor Administration,
United States Department of Agriculture.
W. L. HEAPE,
Colonial Secretary.

TEXT OF CONTRACT WITH BAHAMIAN WORKER

(The contract with the Bahamian workers follows:)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
WORK AGREEMENT

(Bahamas Workers)

THIS AGREEMENT, made this day of , 19 , between the United States of America, hereinafter called the "Government" and of Bahama Islands, hereinafter called the "Worker."

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the Government and the Worker mutually desire that the Worker shall be beneficially employed in the United States of America to alleviate the present shortage of agricultural labor and to aid in the successful prosecution of the war.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of this and of the undertakings hereinafter stated, the Government and the Worker agree that:

1. The Worker shall accept transportation, food, living facilities, subsistence, and employment upon the terms set forth in this agrement; and shall execute such other agreements, vouchers, and instruments as the Government may require to effect those terms.

2. The Government, at its expense, shall:

a. Transport, or arrange for the transportation of, the Worker and the members of his family named in Schedule A on the back of this agreement, all of whom (including the Worker) are herein called the "Family", and not in excess of seventy-five pounds of personal belongings for each of them, from , State of herein called the "port of entry," to such place or places in, and within, the United States, as the Government shall determine to be suitable for the employment of the Worker, and, upon the fulfillment by the Worker of his obligations hereunder, return to the point of origin.

b. Furnish, or arrange to have furnished, to the Worker and the Family all necessary food, health and medical care, and other subsistence living facilities during transportation.

3. The Government shall:

a. Cause the Worker to be employed as an agricultural laborer in the United States for at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the workdays (each day of the week except Sunday to be considered a workday) between the day after the Worker's arrival at the original point of destination in the United States and , 19 , hereinafter called the "period of employment", or, in the absence of such employment, make the Worker a minimum subsistence allowance of $3.00 per day for each workday within said minimum of seventy-five percent (75%) of the workdays that he is not so employed; provided, however, that no subsistence allowance shall be made for workdays in which the Worker is unemployed as a result of his refusal to work or his illness or other physical incapacity. The amount of such subsistence allowance, if any, shall be computed and the payment thereof shall be made at the end of the period of employment, provided, however, that in the event that this agreement is for a period in excess of ninety (90) days, such subsistence allowance shall be computed and the payment thereof shall be made at the end of each ninety (90) day period.

b. In the event of need as determined by the Government, furnish necessary food, shelter, health and medical care, and other subsistence living facilities during the periods of unemployment occurring within the period of employment.

4. Employment under this Agreement shall be upon the following terms:

a. The Worker shall do all work required of him by his employer or employers hereunder during the period of employment in a good and workmanlike manner under the supervision and direction of such employer or employers, but shall not be required to work on Sundays.

b. A workday shall contain not less than eight hours nor more than twelve hours; provided, however, that to determine the amount of employment under paragraph 3a above, the Government may, in its discretion, add hours of work less than eight done on any day except Sunday, to hours of work less than eight done on any other day except Sunday, and for such purpose each ten hours of work shall be counted as a workday.

c. Work shall be paid for in lawful money of the Government at the end of each week of work, at not less than the prevailing wage rates within the particular area of employment; provided, however, that piece work rates, for work to be performed upon that basis, shall be set, so as to enable the Worker, if of average ability, to earn for a fair day's work not less than the prevailing wages; provided further that, in no event, whether the Worker is employed at hourly, piece, or other rate, shall the Worker receive less than 30 cents an hour.

d. No collection, deduction, or rebate from wages or allowances shall be made for commissions, fees, or any other purposes whatsoever, except as may be required by law or as may be necessary to pay the Worker's bona fide and voluntarily incurred debts to the Employer.

e. The Worker shall be employed exclusively as an agricultural worker.

f. The Worker shall be entitled to the benefit and protection of all applicable child labor, compensation, and other laws and regulations of the Government and of the State or States in which the work is performed.

g. The Worker shall not be required to purchase articles or services for consumption or use by him or the Family at any source not of his choice.

h. The Worker shall be entitled to freedom from discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color or national origin, in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order No. 8802 of the President of the United States, dated June 25, 1941.

i. Food, shelter, health and medical services, and other living facilities provided for the Worker and the Family by the Government or any employer shall meet reasonable minimum standards approved by the Government.

j. There shall be no strikes, lockouts, or stoppages of work during the period of employment. All disputes between the Worker and his employer or employers shall be determined by mediation according to procedure prescribed by the Government.

5. The Worker agrees that $ out of his wages for each day on which he is employed, or out of his subsistence allowance, if any, for each day on which he is not employed, shall be deducted from his wages or subsistence allowance and transmitted to the Bahamas Government to be placed to his credit in accordance with arrangements between the Worker and the Bahamas Government.

6. The Worker represents that he knows of no reason which would prevent his admission to the United States. If after his admission the Worker is found to be or becomes subject to deportation under the laws of the United States, or if the Government determines that the Worker is unable or unwilling to work in accordance with the terms of this agreement, or if the Worker violates any law of the United States, this agreement may forthwith be terminated by the Government. Upon such termination, or upon expiration of this agreement, the Worker shall immediately return to the port of entry at the expense of the Government. Upon his arrival at such port of entry the Government will deliver him to a representative of the Bahamas Government whereupon all responsibility of the Government under this agreement shall cease and determine.

7. All rights, privileges, and powers herein conferred upon the Government shall be exercised by the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, or his duly authorized representatives.

In witness whereof, this Work Agreement has been executed as of the date first above written.

United States of America,
By _____
_____
(Official Title)
Farm Security Administration,
United States Department of Agriculture.

Witnesses:

_____ _____
(Worker)

_____

TEXT OF CONTRACT WITH EMPLOYERS OF BAHAMIAN WORKERS

(The contract with the employers of Bahamian workers follows:)

United States Department of Agriculture

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Cooperative Employment Agreement

(Bahamas Workers)

This cooperative employment agreement, made this____day of_____ 194__, between the United States of America, hereinafter called the "Government", and_____, of_____, State of_____, hereinafter called the "Employer."

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the Government and the Employer wish to cooperate in making agricultural workers available to alleviate the present shortage of agricultural labor and to aid in the successful prosecution of the war,

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the undertakings hereinafter stated, the Government and the Employer agree as follows:

1. The Government shall use its best efforts to recruit and transport agricultural workers to

hereinafter called the "destination point(s)", for employment by the Employer, and, upon completion of that employment, to such points as the Government shall determine to be proper.

2. The Employer shall employ, exclusively as agricultural workers, and upon the following terms, as many agricultural workers, not exceeding_____, as are transported by the Government to the destination point(s) not later than _____, 19__, the number of workers to be transported to each destination point being as follows: not exceeding____workers to_____:

a. The Employer shall employ each worker at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the possible workdays (each calendar day except Sunday to be considered a possible workday) between the day following the day of the worker's arrival at one of the destination points and_____, 19__, hereinafter called the "period of employment."

b. The Employer shall be required to furnish such employment to a worker hereunder only so long as the worker is ready, willing, and able to work under the supervision and direction of the Employer; but shall not require the worker to work on Sundays.

c. Work shall be paid for in lawful money of the United States Government at least once each week. The workers shall not be subjected to wage discrimination, but shall be paid for their work at not less than the prevailing wage rates for such work within the particular area of employment. The Employer may choose whether to pay by hourly, piece, or other rates; provided, however, that piece work rates, for work to be performed upon that basis, shall be set by the Employer so as to enable workers of average ability to earn for a fair day's work not less than the prevailing wage rates. In no event, whether the workers are employed at hourly, piece, or other rates, shall the workers receive less than 30 cents an hour. The prevailing wage rates shall be conclusively determined by the Government.

d. A workday shall contain not less than eight hours nor more than twelve hours; provided, however, that to determine the amount of employment under paragraph 2 of this agreement, hours of work less than eight done on any day except Sunday may, if the Government consents, be added to hours of work less than eight done on any other day except Sunday, and for such purpose each ten hours of work shall be counted as a workday.

e. The Employer shall pay each worker a subsistence allowance of Three Dollars ($3) for each possible workday upon which he is not employed within said minimum of 75 percent of the days that he is not so employed pursuant to subparagraph a above; provided, however, that no such subsistence allowance shall be paid for possible workdays in which the worker is unemployed as the result of his refusal to work or his illness or other physical incapacity. The amount of such subsistence allowance, if any, shall be computed and paid at the end of the period of employment, provided, however, that in the event that the worker's agreement with the Government requires such payment to be computed and paid at the end of each 90-day period, it shall be so computed and paid.

f. The Employer shall pay all costs of transportation of the workers (and the members of their families transported with them by the Government) between the destination point(s) to which they were so transported by the Government and the place or places at which the workers are to perform their work hereunder, and return to their said destination point(s).

g. Collections, deductions, or rebates from the workers' wages or allowances may be made as required by law or as may be necessary to pay the workers' bona fide and voluntarily incurred debts to the Employer, but not otherwise.

h. The Employer shall pay to the Government, in trust for each such worker who has been transported by the Government from the Bahamas for employment in the United States, $_____ out of his wages for each day on which

he is employed, which portion of his wages each such worker will have assigned to the Government in trust, to be held or controlled and disposed of by the Government under the terms of its agreement with the worker.

i. The workers shall be entitled to the benefit and protection of all applicable child labor, compensation, and other laws and regulations of the Government and of the State or States in which the work is performed. No person under 18 years of age shall be employed under this agreement.

j. The workers shall not be required to purchase articles or services for consumption or use by them or their families at any source not of their choice.

k. The workers shall be entitled to freedom from discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin, in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order 8802 of the President of the United States, dated June 25, 1941.

l. The Employer shall make no discrimination between the workers employed hereunder and other workers employed by him, with respect to living conditions and sanitary and medical services. Insofar as practical, workers employed under this agreement shall be housed in camps maintained by the Government. Where such camps are not available, the workers shall be housed only in quarters approved by the Government.

m. There shall be no strikes, lockouts, or stoppages of work during the period of employment. All disputes between the workers and the Employer shall be determined by mediation according to procedure prescribed by the Government.

3. The Government shall determine from time to time, and its determination shall be conclusive, whether the Employer has paid all sums to be paid by him hereunder, and shall have the right to pay (as subsistence allowances or otherwise) to the persons it determines to be entitled thereto, all or any part of any such sums which it determines have not been paid, in which case the Employer shall repay to the Government, upon demand by it, all sums so paid, together with interest thereupon at the rate of six (6%) percent per annum from the date or dates of such payments by the Government.

4. The Employer shall keep, upon forms to be supplied by the Government, full and complete records of the employment and wages of each worker under this agreement. Such records shall be at all times open to inspection and examination by the Government, which shall be entitled to make copies thereof. The Employer shall also file with the Government such reports concerning said employment and wages as the Government may from time to time require.

5. If the Government determines that the Employer has violated any of the terms or undertakings of this agreement, it may, without waiving any other remedy or course of action, deprive the Employer of the further services of the workers under this agreement.

6. All rights, privileges, and powers conferred herein by the Government shall be exercised in its behalf by the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, or his duly authorized representative.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Government and the Employer have executed this agreement as of the date first above written.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

By_____

_____
(Official title)

Witnesses:

_____

_____

_____
(Employer)

By_____

TEXT OF NEW CONTRACT BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND FARM GROWER

Senator RUSSELL. You also stated you had amended the contract with the grower, by the elimination of the $5 transportation charge. In the contract in the House hearings, that $5 charge is still in there; so if you have a copy of your new contract with the grower, we would like to have that for the record, also.

Mr. DARROW. Yes, sir. I believe Farm Security Administration made that commitment in the field, perhaps at that meeting down in Arizona back in February; and I am concurring in it and continuing it. We have not made a formal announcement, but it is well known.

(The contract follows:)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

COOPERATIVE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT

THIS COOPERATIVE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT, made this _____ day of _____, 19__, between the United States of America, hereinafter called the "Government," and _____, of _____, State of _____, hereinafter called "Employer."

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS the Government and the Employer wish to cooperate in making agricultural workers available to alleviate the present shortage of agricultural labor and to aid in the successful prosecution of the war:

NOW, THEREFORE, In consideration of the undertakings hereinafter stated, the Government and the Employer agree as follows:

1. The Government shall use its best efforts to recruit and transport agricultural workers for employment by the Employer, from points of origin or intermediate points in the United States or Mexico to the destination point(s) hereinafter stated, and, upon completion of that employment, to the points of origin, or to such intermediate points in the United States as the Government shall determine to be proper. The Government shall notify the Employer of the points of recruitment, and the Employer may, if he desires, be represented during the recruiting process.

2. The Employer shall employ, upon the following terms, _____ such agricultural workers if they are transported by the Government to the following destination point(s) not later than _____, 19__, the number to be transported to each destination point being as follows: _____, to _____, State of _____.

a. Each worker shall be employed, exclusively as an agricultural worker, for at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the possible workdays (each day in the week except Sunday to be considered a possible workday) between _____, 19__, and _____, 19__, and for such further time as the Employer and the workers, or any of them, may mutually agree, such entire time being hereinafter called the "period of employment."

b. The Employer shall be required to furnish such employment to a worker hereunder only so long as the worker is ready, willing, and able to work under the supervision and direction of the Employer; but shall not require the worker to work on Sundays.

c. The Employer shall pay each worker (except cotton workers paid on a piece rate basis) a minimum subsistence allowance of $3.00 per day for each possible workday within said minimum of seventy-five (75%) of the possible workdays that he is not so employed; privided, however, that no subsistence allowance shall be made for workdays in which the worker is unemployed as the result of his refusal to work or his illness or other physical incapacity. The amount of such subsistence allowance shall be computed and payment therefor shall be made at the end of each ninety (90) day period, if this contract is for a period in excess of ninety (90) days.

d. A Workday shall contain not less than eight hours nor more than twelve hours; provided, however, that to determine the amount of employment under paragraph 2 of this agreement, hours of work less than eight done on any day except Sunday may be added to hours of work less than eight done on any other day except Sunday, and for such purpose each ten hours of work shall be counted as a workday.

e. Work shall be paid for in lawful money of the United States Government at the end of each week of work, at not less than the prevailing piece work or hourly wage rates within the particular area of employment; provided, however, that the Government reserves the right to remove any worker who does not average $3.00 a working day in any pay period. The prevailing wage rates shall be determined by the Wage Boards appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture for that purpose for the particular crops and areas involved.

f. It is mutually agreed that a worker of average ability is one who can, after a three-day training period, at the prevailing piece work rate established by the Government, earn at least three dollars ($3.00) per day.

g. The Employer shall pay all costs of transportation of the workers (and the members of their families transported with them by the Government to the above-specified point(s) of destination) between said destination point(s) and the place or places at which the workers are to perform their work, and return to said destination point(s).

h. No deduction from wages shall be made for commissions, fees, or any other purpose (except as may be required by law), which shall have the effect of reducing the workers' wages below those required by paragraph 2e of this agreement.

i. The Employer shall pay to the Government in trust for each such worker who has been transported by the Government from Mexico for employment in the United States, ten (10) percent of his wages and of the subsistence allowance provided for by paragraph 2c, which portion of his wages and subsistence allowance such worker will have assigned to the Government in trust, to be held or controlled and disposed of by the Government under the terms of its agreement with the worker. This payment shall be made to the Government upon request, and in no event more than 10 days after the termination of the period of employment of the worker.

j. The workers shall be entitled to the benefit and protection of all applicable child labor, compensation, and other laws and regulations of the Government and of the State or States in which the work is performed.

k. The workers shall not be required to purchase articles or services for consumption or use by them or their families at any source not of their choice.

l. The worker shall be entitled to freedom from discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin, in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order No. 8802 of the President of the United States, dated June 25, 1941.

m. The Employer shall make available to the workers and their families, without charge, such shelter facilities as are owned by the Employer and are not otherwise occupied within the period of employment.

n. There shall be no strikes, lockouts, or stoppages of work during the period of employment. All disputes between the workers and the Employer shall be determined by mediation according to procedure prescribed by the Government.

3. The Government shall determine from time to time, and its determination shall be conclusive, whether the Employer has paid all sums to be paid by him hereunder, and shall have the right to pay (as subsistence allowances or otherwise) to the persons it determines to be entitled thereto, all or any part of any such sums which it determines have not been paid, in which case the Employer shall repay to the Government, upon demand by it, all sums so paid, together with interest thereupon at the rate of six percent (6%) per annum from the date or dates of such payments by the Government.

4. The Government shall transport under this Agreement both single men and families, but if families are transported the Government shall enter into work contracts only with the heads of the families and such other members of the families as are 18 years of age and over and able and willing to work full time pursuant to the terms of the work contracts and this Agreement. Other members of the families transported may work for the Employer at the prevailing piece or hourly work rate, subject, however, to applicable school and child labor laws.

5. The Employer shall keep, upon forms to be supplied by the Government, full and complete records of the employment and wages of each worker under this Agreement. Such records shall be at all times open to inspection and examination by the Government, which shall be entitled to make copies thereof.

6. If the Government determines that the Employer has violated any of the terms or undertakings of this Agreement, it may, without waiving any other remedy or course of action, deprive the Employer of the further services of the workers under this Agreement.

7. All rights, privileges, and powers conferred herein upon the Government shall be exercised in its behalf by the Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture, or his duly authorized representative.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Government and the Employer have executed this agreement as of the date first above written.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

By _____

_____
(Official Title)
Farm Security Administration,
United States Department of Agriculture.

_____
(Employer)

By _____

Witnesses:

_____

_____

TYPE OF ORGANIZATION NEEDED TO HANDLE FARM LABOR PROBLEM

Mr. DARROW. May I add, Mr. Chairman, this one more short statement?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. DARROW. I think whoever handles the migratory labor problem has a very, very tough job. And regardless of the organization that handles it, I believe it must be a straight-line organization, straight from the point where they are recruited to where they are placed. It is a job of engineering, on camp construction; it is a job of transportation, of handling people; it is a job of public relations, of getting along with growers on the one hand and with laborers on the other. I believe it can only be handled by such an organization, regardless of where it is put.

Senator RUSSELL. Have you anything further, Senator O'Mahoney?

Senator O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. Chairman.

Senator RUSSELL. Have you anything further, Mr. Darrow?

Mr. DARROW. No; thank you.

Senator RUSSELL. We are very glad to have had you gentlemen with us.

TELEGRAM TO SENATOR HOLMAN FROM APPLE GROWERS ASSOCIATION, HOOD RIVER, OREG.

NEED IN OREGON FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOR RECRUITED FROM OTHER AREAS

(Senator Holman submitted for the record the following telegram:)

HOOD RIVER, OREG.,
March 25, 1943.

Senator RUFUS HOLMAN.

Since Hood River growers will undoubtedly have to depend on agricultural labor recruited in other agricultural sections such as Arkansas and Mississippi this year, we view with considerable misgiving the provisions of the Pace amendment to House Resolution 96 which requires approval of State agricultural directors and local county agents in areas where this labor is being recruited. While we recognize that such recruiting areas need some protection from indiscriminate recruiting of agricultural labor, we urge further consideration of this provision which we think will completely block the transfer of agricultural labor from above-mentioned areas in spite of probable surpluses of agricultural labor.

APPLE GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
J. E. KLAHRE, *General Manager.*

QUESTION AS TO WHETHER FARMERS HAVE TO HAVE A PERMIT AND ALSO OBTAIN RATION TICKETS FOR MEAT THEY SELL

(See p. 56)

(The following information was furnished for the record by the Department of Agriculture:)

Farmers who are not engaged in the business of selling meat but who occasionally sell a ham, side, or other cuts of pork or other meats must obtain a permit to slaughter the livestock from the Director of Food Distribution Administration. County United States Department of Agriculture war boards will issue permits to local slaughterers in the name of the director. A farmer similar to those described above would be technically known under Food Distribution Order No. 27, issued March 5, 1943, as "farm slaughterers." Any farm slaughterer may sell meat which was slaughtered primarily for home consumption and obtain a permit subsequent to the sale. The quota for such a farmer would be either 300 pounds of meat or the meat produced from three head of livestock, which may include not more than one head of cattle.

A farmer may comply with the requirement that each wholesale cut of meat be marked with the assigned permit number by attaching to any meat he might sell a tag which bears the number of the permit issued to him by the United States Department of Agriculture war board. In addition, he must keep an accurate record of the livestock slaughtered by him and of any meat he might sell.

In accordance with the provisions of Office of Price Administration Ration Order No. 16, dated March 20, 1943, it is necessary that the farmer collect meat ration coupons to cover the sale of the meat. This is required by article X, section 10.4, which is as follows:

HOW FOODS COVERED BY THIS ORDER ARE TRANSFERRED TO CONSUMERS

(*a*) General: Foods covered by this order may be transferred to a consumer, and may be acquired by him, only if he gives up to the seller or transferor, points exactly equal to the point value of the foods transferred, except that fractional amounts are to be handled in the way described in section 10.6 (certain transactions between consumers covered in section 2.2 are excepted from this rule).

This exception relates to loan of meat from one vendor to another where repayment is to be made in kind. There is attached a copy of Food Distribution Order No. 27. Office of Price Administration Ration Order No. 16 issued March 20, 1943, is published in Federal Register, volume A, No. 58, for Wednesday, March 24, 1943.

FOOD DISTRIBUTION ADMINISTRATION

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

[Food Distribution Order 27]

PART 1410—LIVESTOCK AND MEATS

PERMIT REQUIRED FOR SLAUGHTER

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by Executive Order No. 9280, dated December 5, 1942, and to assure an adequate supply and efficient distribution of beef, veal, pork, lamb, and mutton to meet war and essential civilian needs, *It is hereby ordered*, as follows:

§ 1410.4 *Sanitary and other restricions on slaughter of livestock.*—(a) *Definitions.* When used in this order, unless otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof:

(1) The term "meat" means the carcasses of cattle, calves, sheep, lambs, and swine (hereinatfer also called beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork, respectively) and any processed or unprocessed edible part, excluding, however, offal, oils, lards, rendering fats, raw leaf, casings, by-products not ordinarily used for human consumption, and skins of swine when prepared for use in leather, glue and gelatin.

(2) The term "deliver" means to transfer physical possession of meat to any other person. The transfer of meat by a slaughterer, who also qualifies as an authorized processor, to a unit or department of the slaughterer for use in the preparation, manufacture, or production of any product for delivery to a governmental agency under a contract to sell or deliver to that agency, or the use of meat for such a product, shall be deemed a delivery to the governmental agency.

(3) The term "livestock" means four types of meat animals, singly or collectively, namely: (i) Cattle, (ii) calves, (iii) hogs and pigs, and (iv) sheep and lambs.

(4) The term "local slaughterer" means any person who in 1941 slaughtered livestock with a total live weight in excess of 300,000 pounds and who is not registered with the Office of Price Administration as a slaughterer in accordance with Meat Resriction Order 1, as amended.[1]

(5) The term "butcher" means any person, other than a farm slaughterer, as defined herein, who slaughters livestock and who in 1941 did not slaughter livestock with a total live weight of more than 300,000 pounds.

(6) The term "farm slaughterer" means any person who is chiefly engaged in producing agricultural products as the resident operator of a farm, who slaughters livestock, and who in 1941 did not deliver meat from the slaughter of livestock with a live weight of more than 10,000 pounds.

(7) The term "minimum sanitary facilities" means a structure that is reasonably fly and rodent proof with ample light and ventilation, which has concrete or comparably sanitary floors with adequate drainage system, and is provided with clean water, and which, togeher with all equipment, is in a clean and orderly condition. Such structure must be a reasonable distance from stables, barnyard, hoglot, refuse heap, privy, or other source of fly breeding or contamination.

(8) The term "adequate facilities" means:

(i) Equipment in good order for the proper skinning and dressing of animals and rendering of fat or tallow, and

(ii) Storage and other equipment for retaining or preserving edible or inedible by-products to insure against spoilage.

(9) The term "slaughter" means to kill livestock for the purpose of obtaining meat. The person who owns the livestock, in whole or in part, at the time of slaughter shall be deemed to be the slaughterer.

(10) The term "governmental agency" means the Food Distribution Administration, United States Department of Agriculture (including, but not restricted to the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation), the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, the United States Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, the Veterans Administration, and any other agency which the Director finds is directly essential to the war effort and which is designated by him; *Provided, however*, That post exchanges, service men's clubs, ship service stores, sales commissaries, and similar organizations shall not be deemed part of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States.

(11) The term "authorized processor" means any person who processes meat and who is under contract to sell or deliver to a governmental agency products prepared, in whole or in part, from meat, or any meat processor who is authorized by the Director to purchase meat.

(12) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, other business entity, or any State or agency thereof.

(13) The term "Director" means the Director of Food Distribution, United States Department of Agriculture, or any employee of the United States Department of Agriculture designated by the Director.

(b) *Permits required by local slaughterer, butcher, or farm slaughterer.* (1) Notwithstanding the terms of any contract, agreement, or commitment. no local slaughterer or butcher shall slaughter any livestock, and no farm slaughterer shall slaughter any livestock for delivery of meat, unless he has a valid and effective permit, issued under this order, at the time of such slaughter, except that a farm slaughterer may deliver meat from livestock slaughtered for home consumption upon obtaining a permit subsequent to such slaughter authorizing such delivery.

(2) Permits for slaughter or for delivery after slaughter as provided in paragraph (b) (1), shall not be issued until the applicant has filed an application on

[1] 7 F.R. 7839; 8217; 8524; 9247; 9250; 9639; 10258; 10621; 10704; 8 F.R. 179; 375; 926; 1204; 1279; 2274; 2498.

a form approved by the Director containing the information required by such form. Application forms shall be obtained from, and filed with, the agency designated by the Director in the city or country in which such slaughter is to take place.

(c) *Sanitary or other facilities required for permit to slaughter.* (1) No local slaughterer or butcher shall be eligible for a permit to slaughter unless the agency designated by the Director to issue permits deems that he has first provided at least minimum sanitary facilities for such slaughter. Compliance with sanitary requirements for Federal, State, county, or city inspection shall be considered as compliance with this requirement.

(2) No local slaughterer, butcher, or farm slaughterer shall deliver, or offer for delivery, any meat or products prepared in whole or in part from meat which is diseased, unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food.

(3) No local slaughterer or butcher shall be eligible for a permit to slaughter unless the agency designated by the Director to issue permits deems that he has first provided adequate facilities for the conservation and preservation of all edible and the principal inedible byproducts.

(d) *Restrictions on slaughter of livestock.* (1) No local slaughterer shall slaughter in any one month, in addition to his deliveries to governmental agencies and authorized processors for delivery to governmental agencies, more livestock of each type than his quota of each type for the month.

(2) No butcher shall slaughter in any one month more livestock than his quota for the month, except that he may slaughter any livestock which he has raised or produced in whole or substantial part for consumption by himself or his household of any meat produced therefrom.

(3) No farm slaughterer shall slaughter in any calendar quarter more livestock for the delivery of meat produced therefrom than his quota for the quarter. If his quota is established on the basis of the calendar year, he shall not slaughter more livestock for delivery of meat produced therefrom than his quota for the year.

(e) *Quotas for the slaughter of livestock.* (1) The swine quota for each local slaughterer in any one month shall be a percentage of the total live weight of swine that he slaughtered in the corresponding month of 1941.

(2) The quota of cattle, calves, or sheep, including lambs, for each local slaughterer in any one month shall be a percentage of the quantity of meat produced by his slaughter of each type in the corresponding month of 1941.

(3) The quota for each butcher in any one month shall be his choice of (i) the number of each type of livestock which he slaughtered in the corresponding month of 1941, or (ii) the total live weight of livestock which he slaughtered in the corresponding month of 1941.

(4) The quota for any calendar quarter for any farm slaughterer who furnishes a record of his slaughter in 1941 shall be his choice of (i) the number of each type of livestock which he slaughtered in the corresponding quarter of 1941 and from which any meat was delivered, or (ii) the total live weight of livestock which he slaughtered in the corresponding quarter of 1941 and from which any meat was delivered. The local agency issuing the slaughter permit may authorize transfer of such slaughter quotas from one quarter to the immediately preceding quarter or next succeeding quarter.

(5) The quotas for any calendar year for any farm slaughterer who does not furnish a record of his slaughter in 1941 shall be his choice of (i) 300 pounds of meat, or (ii) any part of the meat produced from three head of livestock, which may include not more than one head of cattle.

(6) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this paragraph (e), the quotas for any local slaughterer, butcher, or farm slaughterer shall be reduced during as many successive quota periods immediately following March 31, 1943, as necessary to make the amounts of such reductions equal the amounts by which the Office of Price Administration determines that his deliveries during the period between October 1, 1942, and March 31, 1943, have exceeded the amounts permitted under Meat Restriction Order No. 1, as amended. Such amounts may be calculated on the same basis as the quotas are calculated.

(7) The percentages to be used in the determination of quotas for local slaughterers referred to in paragraphs (e) (1) and (e) (2) shall be 80 percent for the month of April 1943, and shall be such percentages for succeeding months as shall be established by the Director in accordance with the level of civilian meat allocations established from time to time by the Secretary.

84461—43——15

(8) The Director is authorized to adjust the percentages or quotas for any class of slaughterers in any area where he determines that the total quantity of meat available is insufficient to fill ration requirements and that the quantity of livesock available for slaughter exceeds the quantity that may be slaughtered within the quotas of all classes of slaughterers.

(9) The Director may issue regulations authorizing regional agencies to adjust the quotas for any butcher or farm slaughterer, or authorizing State or county agencies, including State or County USDA War Boards, to adjust the quotas for any farm slaughterer, in the following cases:

(i) In any area in which the Director determines that adjustments for butchers or farm slaughterers are needed because the total quantity of meat available is insufficient to fill ration requirements and that the quantity of livestock available for slaughter exceeds the quantity that may be slaughtered within the quotas of all classes of slaughterers, or

(ii) In any instance in which the slaughter of any butcher or farm slaughterer in the corresponding period of 1941 was not normal for him.

(f) *Markings required on meat.* (1) Each accessible wholesale cut of meat whether in the entire carcass or detached therefrom, when delivered by a local slaughterer, butcher, or farm slaughterer, shall be marked in a plain and conspicuous manner one or more times with the letter "P" and the permit number assigned. After a permit has been obtained, any slaughterer under Federal, State, county, or city inspection who has been assigned an establishment number may use such number in lieu of his permit designation. Any farm slaughterer who delivers meat directly to an individual or household by whom the meat is to be consumed may comply with this requirement by attaching to such meat a tag bearing his permit number.

(2) In the case of veal carcasses delivered with the skin on, the mark shall be placed on the hind shanks and brisket

(3) Such marking as prescribed in paragraphs (f) (1) and (f) (2) shall be done in letters at least ¼ inch in height and wid h. It shall be done with a pencil approved for Kosher marking or with a stamp or stencil and marking fluid conforming to the approved formula for violet branding fluid, which is as follows:

	Ounces
Water	3.5
Grain Alcohol—95%	2.5
Cane Sugar	1.0
Methyl Violet	0.1

The methyl violet is dissolved in the alcohol and a portion of the water; the sugar is dissolved in the remaining portion of the water and added to the methyl violet solution. Thorough stirring facilitates solution of the methyl violet.

(g) *Records and reports.* Every person subject to this order shall keep an accurate record by quota periods of the numbers, live weight, or meat production of livestock slaughtered, as specified in his quota, and shall maintain such other records and shall execute and file such reports upon such forms as the Director may request or direct, and within such time as he may prescribe. This record keeping requirement has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with the Federal Reports Act of 1942.

(h) *Audits and inspections.* Every person subject to this order shall, upon request, permit inspections, at all reasonable times, of his stocks of meat and of the premises used in his business, and all his books, records, and accounts shall, upon request, be submitted to audit and inspection by the Director.

(i) *Territorial scope.* The provisions of this order shall apply only to operations conducted within any of the 48 States or the District of Columbia.

(j) *Petition for relief from hardship.* Any person affected by this order who considers that compliance herewith would work an exceptional and unreasonable hardship on him may petition, in writing (in triplicate), for relief to the Director, setting forth all pertinent facts and the nature of the relief sought. The Director may thereupon take such action as he deems appropriate and such action shall be final.

(k) *Violations.* Any person who wilfully violates any provision of this order or who by any act or omission falsifies records to be kept or information to be furnished pursuant to this order, or who wilfully conceals a material fact concerning a matter within the scope of this order, may be prohibited from receiving

or making further deliveries of any material subjct to allocation and such further action may be taken against him as the Director deems appropriate, including the suspension or the revocation of his permit, and including recommendations for prosecution under section 35a of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 1940 ed. 80), under paragraph 5 of section 301 of Title III of the Second War Powers Act, and under any and all other applicable laws.

(l) *Communications to Director.* All communications concerning this order shall, unless otherwise directed, be addressed to Director of Food Distribution, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., Ref.: FD-27.

(m) *Effective date.* This order shall become effective at 12:00 o'clock midnight on March 31, 1943.

(E.O. 9280 7 F.R. 10179)

Issued this 5th day of March 1943.
[SEAL]

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture.

Senator RUSSELL. The committee will stand in recess until 10:30 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1:55 p. m., the subcommittee was adjourned until 10:30 the following morning, Friday, March 26, 1943.)

FARM LABOR PROGRAM, 1943

FRIDAY, MARCH 26, 1943

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met in the committee room, the Capitol, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:30 a. m., Hon. Richard B. Russell presiding.

Present: Senators Russell, Hayden, Thomas of Oklahoma, McCarran, Nye, and Holman.

Senator RUSSELL. The committee will come to order.

STATEMENT OF HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Senator RUSSELL. Judge, if you wish, you may go ahead. Customarily we wait until there are some Republican members present, but they will be in in a few minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Pace, this meets with your approval?

Mr. PACE. Yes. Go ahead.

Senator RUSSELL. I will be glad to wait. I am not rushing you. I would prefer to have some more members of the committee here. They will be here in a few minutes.

HOUSE PROVISO REQUIRING CONSENT OF COUNTY AGENTS AND STATE AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONERS FOR MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the retention if possible in H. J. Res. 96 of the language of the amendment adopted in the House which was offered by my colleague from Georgia, Representative Pace, and which forbids the carrying on of a labor-recruitment program in any county without the consent of the extension agent and in any State without the consent of the Commissioner of Agriculture.

The language of the amendment is not entirely satisfactory to me because I feel that no recruitment program should be carried on in a county without the approval of the A. A. A. committee selected by the vote of the farmers of that county; but at the same time, the restriction imposed by the language of the amendment as to county recruitment campaigns is better than no restriction at all.

As the chairman of the subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in the House, I was invited to attend some of the hearings had before the deficiency subcommittee in the House in the consideration of the pending bill and heard a portion of the evidence which was

developed before that subcommittee, to which I shall hereafter make reference.

LETTER TO CONGRESSMAN TARVER FROM S. J. WHATLEY RELATIVE TO RECRUITMENT OF FARM LABOR IN FLOYD COUNTY, GA.

As preliminary to a discussion of some of that evidence, however, I want to read to you a letter which I received under date of January 26, 1943, from Mr. S. J. Whatley, Plainville, Ga., one of the leading farmers of Floyd County, Ga., a gentleman who at one time served as a member of the county board of commissioners of that county. He writes:

I am enclosing a notice that came to most of the tenant farmers around here Saturday. Four of mine went to Rome yesterday, and this Mr. Farmer told three of them that they had to either go to Florida to pick tomatoes or go to war. Two of these men are around 45 years old. Some say they are going to Florida. Some told him they were not going.

Has this man got that much authority?

He told them they could come back early in April and make a crop.

I cannot see how farmers are going to farm this year if our help is going to be carried from place to place after we have furnished houses, wood, pasture, and some cash to winter the help and then have some guy to say when they can work on the farm they live on.

USE BEING MADE BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OF SELECTIVE SERVICE LISTS

Enclosed with the letter was a notice dated January 22, 1943, which had been delivered by mail to one of the tenants of Mr. Whatley, which reads:

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE,
522 Broad St., Rome, Ga.

Your selective service occupational questionnaire shows you have a farm background. Please see Mr. Ernest Farmer in the U. S. Employment Service Office at 522 Broad Street, Rome, Ga., by Monday, January 25, 1943.

M. A. N. PATTON,
Manager.

In other words, in this program as it has been carried on heretofore they have been sending into your State and mine, Mr. Chairman, men who have been furnished with a list of registrants for selective service who have farm background and have been notifying those registrants, even when they were tenants who had made a contract with landlords, for the year 1943, to meet them at the local employment office and upon their arrival there had been advising them that they must leave their landlords—violate their contracts with their landlords and go to Florida to accept employment, or else be placed in the Army.

CONSENT OF RESPONSIBLE STATE AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES SHOULD BE REQUIRED FOR RECRUITMENT PURPOSES WITHIN A STATE OR COUNTY

I do not believe that any authority of the Federal Government ought to have the right to carry on such a program. I do not believe that, in the absence of consent by a responsible authority in a county, such a recruitment program should be carried on in a county nor that in the absence of consent on the part of responsible authorities in a

State such a program as it affects interstate transportation of labor should be carried on in a State.

EVIDENCE PRESENTED TO SUBCOMMITTEES OF HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

I made reference a few moments ago to some of the evidence which was delivered before the deficiency subcommittee in the House, in the consideration of this bill, and which I had the opportunity to hear. The evidence of the witness who testified which was more nearly in accord with the past program for this labor recruitment proposition in my judgment was that of the executive secretary of the Farmers' Union, Mr. Robert Handschin. His evidence indicated an idea that in certain sections of the country, particularly in the South, there are hundreds of thousands of farm workers and in many instances owners of small farms who are located on farms that are not fertile, and whose efforts would be of more value to agricultural production if they were transferred to other sections of the country, where they might be employed on more fertile lands and produce more abundantly. While the evidence was not delivered before the subcommittee on deficiency appropriations Mr. Baldwin, who is head of the Farm Security Administration, delivered similar evidence recently before the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations.

These gentlemen seem to have the idea which was advanced a few years ago by the then Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Henry A. Wallace, that there are some 2,000,000 farmers in the South whose ancestors made a mistake in locating in what they regard as a God-forsaken section of the country and that they ought to be persuaded in some way to remove themselves from the locality where the local advantages as to education, association with people of high intelligence, etc., are not comparable in their judgment to those which obtain in other parts of the United States and to give up, when they are owners of small and not largely productive farms, their farms and to immigrate to other sections of the country where by securing employment as farm hands on the lands of the more fertile lands of farm owners in those sections they can contribute more abundantly to agricultural production.

OBJECTIVE OF FARM-LABOR PROGRAM AS ORIGINALLY LAID OUT

I am, of course, not in accord with that sort of plan. I believe that this farm-labor program as it was originally laid out had in view, not altogether the relief of the emergent need for farm labor which is generally recognized to exist, but the carrying out of some of these wildcat theories with regard to the relocation of the agricultural population of the country, and I do not conceive it to be the purpose of any appreciable number of the Members of Congress to facilitate the carrying out of such a program at this particular time.

When I addressed the House with regard to this bill, I suggested that the ideas of most members were to secure labor for their own localities; nobody had any labor that he wanted transported to any other locality; and I asked the Membership of the House if any member had a surplus of labor which could be used for agriculture

in his congressional district. I requested any such member to arise and give us the benefit of his information on that subject, and not a single Member arose.

So that this is a program, undoubtedly, by which men who are interested in it intend not to furnish labor from their congressional districts or their States, but to secure from other sections much needed labor for their congressional districts and their States through the operation of this program.

LOCAL RELIEF OF FARM-LABOR PROBLEM SHOULD BE ACCORDED WHERE POSSIBLE

Now, it is all right if there can be relief accorded to local situations through local operations, and I think that a measure of relief, not considerable in character, might be so accorded; but to have men come into the State of Georgia, for example, as has been true in the program which has been carried on, where we have not a surplus of farm labor, and to undertake to induce either by persuasion or by threats of being forced into military service, the tenants of farmers who are satisfied with their contracts to violate those contracts and go into other States to accept employment is not a desirable function of the Government and there ought to be inhibitions contained in this bill which will prevent such abuse of discretion in the carrying on of whatever program which may be authorized by Congress.

PROVISION ALONG LINES OF PACE AMENDMENT SHOULD BE RETAINED IN BILL

The Pace amendment certainly to an appreciable extent guards against such an abuse of administrative discretion.

As I said a while ago, I think that the power to veto such a recruitment program in a county ought to be vested in the county A. A. A. committee elected by the farmers themselves; but vesting it in the county extension agent is better than having no veto power vested anywhere.

I simply want to urge, Mr. Chairman, that if you do approve House Joint Resolution 96, either in the language of the House bill, or in some modified or enlarged form that an inhibition of the type of the Pace amendment by all means should be included in the language of the resolution.

USE BEING MADE BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OF SELECTIVE SERVICE LISTS

Senator RUSSELL. You certainly present a rather outrageous case here, Judge. I have had one like that myself.

Mr. TARVER. I want to say before I conclude, I have had many other communications from my district of a similar type to the communication from Mr. Whatley; not only one; but I have received several. I have read that as a fair sample of these communications, and as an evidence of what has been going on, and which we may expect will be continued unless Congress in the passage of this resolution shall take steps to prevent it.

Senator RUSSELL. I am surprised, in view of that action on the part of the authorities, of the Employment Service, that the House gave them as much power as they did under this bill.

Just as a matter of curiosity, did you submit any of this correspondence to the officials of the Employment Service to find out whether it was authorized or whether they intend to tolerate such practices as they claim to have vested, in inflicting penalties upon a man who does not do what they wish?

Mr. TARVER. I did, Mr. Chairman, with very unsatisfactory results. As I recall—I am sorry I did not bring that part of my file with me—the report was made as to the number of tenants who had been taken from this area for Florida, which was not very considerable. I have forgotten the exact number. Also, as to the program having been abandoned after the receipt of some protests from the authorities in Floyd County, Ga.

Senator RUSSELL. It is bad enough to lure a man off of the farm with a promise of increased wages where he has already entered into a firm contract, but it is much worse to threaten him if he does not leave the farm and break his contract.

Mr. TARVER. I call your attention to the very form of the notice.

Senator RUSSELL. It has implications; I notice that.

Mr. TARVER. There was no need of it. Unless they desired to threaten induction into military service they did not need to say anything about the Selective Service questionnaire. They could simply have addressed a note to him stating that they were endeavoring to secure farm labor to go to Florida and ask him to call; but they particularly stressed his Selective Service occupational questionnaire and the fact that it did disclose that he had a farm background.

Senator RUSSELL. And they went down there and told him that he would either have to go to Florida or go into the Army.

Mr. TARVER. One or the other.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator RUSSELL. We are very glad to have heard you, Judge.

STATEMENT OF HON. STEPHEN PACE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT REQUIRING CONSENT OF COUNTY AGENTS AND STATE COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE FOR MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

Senator RUSSELL. All right, Mr. Pace, we will be glad to hear you.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with Judge Tarver in soliciting the favorable consideration of this committee in retaining this language in the bill.

Senator McCARRAN. Which language are you referring to?

Mr. PACE. I will read it, Senator. (Reading:)

Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, or for the transportation of any worker outside the limits of the State where he resides or is working without the prior consent in writing of the Commissioner of Agriculture for such State or other official who performs similar functions for such State.

RECRUITING AGENCIES PROVIDED IN PENDING MEASURE

Mr. Chairman, a close reading of this bill will show that there are two very separate and distinct recruiting functions set up. One is a

recruiting within the counties, within the State, for the movement of workers from one part of the State to another. The other, very separate and distinct, is a recruitment for the transportation beyond the limits of the State.

I am a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, and we have been working on the farm labor problem since February a year ago.

NO SURPLUS OF LABOR OUTSIDE OF CITIES

We know, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, that there is not today any area in the United States, outside of the cities, that has a surplus of labor.

In my own State, we have made a rather comprehensive survey and today there is a 30-percent shortage of labor in Georgia.

We, of course, are sitting right above Florida where they have a great need at times for an augmentation of their labor supply.

PENDING MEASURE SETS UP NATIONAL SYSTEM OF PIRATING LABOR

You are setting up here, Mr. Chairman—I am sure the thought has occurred to you—in this bill a national system of pirating of labor. You are setting up something here that I do not like. You are setting up a Federal agency to go into every State in this Union to take its citizens and transport them here and there under the inducement of higher wages and free transportation.

In my judgment, you are performing a great disservice to the farmers of this Nation. In my judgment, you are inviting another civil war, not between the North and the South, but between the 48 States of this Nation.

We tested every Member of Congress we could reach in the House. Not a single Member has stated from their correspondence and their contacts that they have been able to determine any spots where there does not exist a shortage of farm labor.

Senator HOLMAN. May I interpose right there?

Senator RUSSELL. Do you object to questions?

Mr. PACE. Not at all; I invite them.

FEDERAL AUTHORITIES HAVE PERMITTED PRESENT CONDITIONS TO ARISE

Senator HOLMAN. I believe I am in harmony with the thought you are intending to convey; but there is considerable indefiniteness in the language when you say "we are doing this" and that. Is it not the Federal departments that are bringing about this deplorable condition, and not the Congress? I would like a little definite statement on that.

Mr. PACE. I think, of course, the Federal authorities have permitted the condition to arise. What I had in mind, Senator, is this: We are today telling the farmer what to plant.

Senator HOLMAN. I want you to be specific. We must aim at the bull's eye. The time has now come to be definite in our charge, or we will never correct the situation.

RESPONSIBILITY HAS BEEN SHIFTED FROM FARMERS TO CONGRESS AND ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITIES

Mr. PACE. I want to make that definite. The farmers are waiting, many of them, expecting us to send them farm labor.

Now, let me clear that up. We are telling them what to plant.

Senator HOLMAN. Who is telling them?

Mr. PACE. The administration.

Senator HOLMAN. That is what I wanted to get. Let us put our finger on it.

Mr. PACE. Let me put it this way: They are told what to plant. They are told how much machinery they can have; and they are told how much fertilizer they can have; and they are told that the Congress and the administration is working on a farm labor problem to get them farm labor. They have, therefore, shifted the responsibility from themselves to us or to the Congress and the administrative authorities.

Senator MCCARRAN. Let me interrupt you, Congressman.

Mr. PACE. Yes, Senator.

Senator MCCARRAN. I think you said it right the first time. They have shifted the responsibility to Congress, because some of those in the field that you might classify as administrative authorities are telling them, "Well, if Congress will do this" and, "if Congress will do that, everything will be all right."

It is all thrown back into the lap of Congress.

FUNDS TO BE APPROPRIATED SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO STATES

Mr. PACE. I think if this committee is going to appropriate $26,000,000 or $65,000,000, the greatest service you could render would be to appropriate the funds as an aid to the States and notify the States—for instance in my State there are 3,000,000 people, in Georgia—and if the people and the farmers of Georgia are given to understand that the responsibility is theirs, and not of the Congress, they will themselves go to work, form their own local organizations under State supervision and produce the crops for Georgia, but that involves some expense. My State now has little money. The regulation of gasoline and other war measures has almost bankrupt my State. It requires a change in your school terms; it requires keeping a certain number of school teachers on the job all summer to act as supervisors, to go out with those school groups to supervise their work, and, therefore, living conditions. It requires the setting up in each county, too, of volunteer organizations to accept volunteers for farm work.

Two weeks ago, in my little home town of 8,000, every single person in the community shut down for the entire day; every person, business, because it was Army and Navy scrap day; and my little county with 26,000 people collected more scrap than any point in the entire State of Georgia. The people felt the responsibility themselves.

On farm labor they now are looking to Washington to get them some farm help.

EFFECT OF ELIMINATING AMENDMENT REQUIRING CONSENT FOR MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

Under this bill, unless this amendment is kept in the bill, we have set up a Federal agency to go into my State and there is not any way in the world to get a man out of my State other than to offer him higher wages and free transportation. When you do, you have immediately lifted the wage scale in the State of Georgia or any other State they go into. That is one reason the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Thomas, is fighting so hard to include farm wages in parity prices, because he knows, and I know that those things are happening every day and will happen tenfold if this bill is enacted.

Now, do you mean to tell me that it is proper to take Federal agents and send them to the State of Georgia to solicit labor, when we haven't any; when we have estimated at least a 30 percent shortage, and take those men and transport them to other areas?

IMPORTATION OF LABOR IS A FEDERAL PROBLEM

There is a Federal problem in bringing in outside labor from the Bahamas or Mexico. There is a Federal problem in the permanent migratory group who cannot drive an automobile, and furnishing them transportation; but outside of that, it seems to me the smart thing to do is to appropriate funds as an aid to the States and let the States set up their own system and tell the States that the responsibility is theirs, and then the will to do it. So long as they think you or I—Mr. Wickard, Mr. Davis, or whoever it might be—is going to furnish farm labor to make their crops they are going to depend upon it.

Senator HOLMAN. You would like to get back to the principles of Thomas Jefferson?

Mr. PACE. I would like to get back in an emergency of this kind, Senator, to an appreciation of the fact that we still have 48 States and that they are the foundation of this Government. Let them understand that they have some responsibility and authority of their own. And send as few Federal agents down there as possible, and certainly I maintain when you send a Federal agent to my home county to solicit labor, when my farmers do not have enough to make their own crops, it is going to be a disastrous situation. Somebody is going to get in trouble and you know it. There is not any doubt about that. Yet, this bill is not only setting up an agency to do that, but is requiring that agency to do it; to go into any State in this Union. I do not know this—but I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that the adoption of this amendment, from the Members who spoke to me, is the only reason this bill ever passed the House of Representatives, because so many members feel just as I do about it.

Senator HAYDEN. Let me ask you a question about the amendment.

Mr. PACE. Yes, Senator.

HOUSE PROVISO GIVES VETO POWER TO COUNTY AGENTS AND STATE AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONERS

Senator HAYDEN. You would give the county agent in any one of the 3,000 agricultural counties in the United States a veto so that nobody could leave his county to work in any other county?

Mr. PACE. That is exactly right; before they come to south Georgia and take them from Sumter County or elsewhere, when we have a 30-percent shortage, to take a man to Barrow County in north Georgia, the local county agent has got to certify that there is a surplus of labor in Sumter County.

Senator HAYDEN. That is one proposition, and it is perfectly clear. Then the same holds true with respect to movement of farm labor out of the States. If a man has a clearance from his county agent, permitting him to leave the county, then he would have to go to the State commissioner of agriculture and get a second clearance to his leaving the State?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Senator HAYDEN. It was urged before this committee that that procedure would practically mean there would be no farm workers moved, because elected State officials would simply say, "I will take no chances on the vote in the next election by letting anybody leave this State when there might be a shortage of farm labor." As a result, no farm laborers would be moved to needed areas.

Mr. PACE. Should anybody be taken out of your State and brought into my State as long as there is a shortage in your State?

Senator HAYDEN. It seems to me that the answer to that question would depend entirely on the season of the year. I will give this as an illustration: Cotton in Texas, Arkansas, and Oklahoma is picked before long staple cotton in Arizona is picked. Now, nobody would move any cotton pickers out of Texas, Oklahoma, or anywhere until the crop is picked in those States. However, when the crop is picked and the migratory pickers want to come to Arizona to pick our cotton in November, December, and January, after the other cotton is all picked, why should they not come?

Mr. PACE. Senator, I said that there was no objection to moving the regular migratory farm workers; but when you have got farms——

DIFFICULTY OF DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN REGULAR AND MIGRATORY WORKERS

Senator HAYDEN. That is the proposition that is bothering me. How are you going to make any distinction between the regular and migratory farm workers and others? Under this House proviso, the worker has to get a permit from the county agent, and furthermore he has to get one from the State.

Mr. PACE. There is but one thing that matters today. So far as the migratory worker is concerned, he needs transportation. He is free under this amendment and no one will prohibit him in the State of Georgia from voluntarily getting up and going to California or Florida.

Here you set up the system of not merely letting him go, but you are going further than that, as Judge Tarver said. You are going further than that. You are soliciting the worker; you are raising his wages; you are offering him transportation. Now, provide funds in here, if you please, that for the migratory worker, you may provide transportation where it is not otherwise available.

WITHOUT CONSENT FARM WORKERS CANNOT BE MOVED UNDER TERMS OF MEASURE AS PASSED BY HOUSE

Senator HAYDEN. Still the prohibition in the bill is absolutely flat whether he is a migratory worker or is not a migratory worker. He cannot get out of a given county by getting gasoline money or getting railroad fare, unless the county agent and then the State agricultural commissioner gives him permission. So, whether he is a migratory worker or not, the requirements are the same under the House proviso.

Senator HOLMAN. Could I make this suggestion: Would you make a distinction between the resident workers and the migratory workers?

Senator HAYDEN. I do not know how you could. As you know, the migratory workers as they work through the West start in southern California, in the Imperial Valley in midwinter and work the vegetable crops. Then they continue up the Pacific coast and on into the Northwest.

Senator HOLMAN. That is correct.

Senator HAYDEN. A lot of them do not have any homes. Formerly, they lived in cheap automobiles and could get all of the gasoline they wanted, and they would follow the crops. Due to gasoline rationing and tire rationing they cannot now go from place to place as they once did.

So they say, "We would be glad to go where farm labor is needed if we could get the gasoline and money with which to buy it."

Mr. PACE. Let him make application.

POSITION OF MIGATORY WORKERS UNDER TERMS OF JOINT RESOLUTION AS PASSED BY HOUSE

Senator HAYDEN. If he does that, and then any county agent where he happens to be at at the moment says, "No, you cannot go," then he cannot get any gasoline money. Or after he has received permission of the county agent and then goes to the State capital and tries to get a certificate, the elected State agricultural commissioner would never sign it. He would say, "I will take no chances on ever letting anybody tell me at the next election that I let some labor out of this State. I just won't do it. That is the safest thing to do." So, there would be no migratory movement at all under that system.

Mr. PACE. Do you not think that the officials of the State after they had finished the crop gathering, if they were needed in other sections temporarily, that those State authorities would permit them to go?

Senator HAYDEN. So far as these elected State officials are concerned, they could say, "No, we do not want to get into any trouble."

Senator HOLMAN. Here is this thought, however, if it results in idleness, those idle men are going to be very antagonistic to some one who prevented them from making a living.

Mr. PACE. That is right.

Senator HAYDEN. Most of them have no votes anywhere. The migratory laborers do not register. They go from one place to the other.

There is another matter that I want to refer to which presents a practical difficulty. Suppose you wanted to go into a municipal area of the United States to recruit farm labor where they had no county agents. If there was not any one there to make the certifications, then how would you take care of the problem?

Mr PACE. No one would object to putting these fellow who are unemployed in the cities to work. No State authority; no county authority in any State is going to do that. There would not be any trouble there. I am not objecting to that.

Senator HAYDEN. This is what I am getting at. It is a positive step that the migratory worker has to take. He has to go to two places and get positive and affirmative permission to move, if he is going to get any help from the Government in getting tires, gasoline, or railroad fare. He cannot get a cent for transportation expenses under the terms of this proviso unless those two positive affirmative steps are taken fom him to move.

Mr. PACE. The thing that I object to is setting up a Federal agency to go into my State or your State and soliciting labor where that labor is badly needed.

Senator HAYDEN. I thoroughly agree with you there that there is no advantage in that.

SEGREGATION OF FOREIGN LABOR PROCUREMENT FROM RECRUITMENT OF DOMESTIC FARM LABOR

You spoke of the importation of foreign laborers. We have had some talk about that before this committee, and I would like to get your judgment on it. It seems to me that the way the bill passed the House, the interstate movement of labor and the importation of labor is all scrambled together. Do you not think it would be a positive advantage if we set up by itself the foreign importation of labor?

Mr. PACE. And knock the rest of the bill out; yes, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. And that we should provide that whatever is done with respect to the importation of labor from Mexico or the West Indies or wherever they may come from, that it will be done by a separate organization inside of and under the general supervision, of course, of whoever handles the problem in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PACE. Right.

Senator HAYDEN. But I think it is now, the whole language of the bill, it is all scrambled together, and it would make it very difficult for administration.

Mr. PACE. I think two Federal questions are involved. One is bringing in outside labor and the other is the selective service and those are the only two Federal problems involved. The balance of it is a State problem.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator RUSSELL. We are very glad to have heard you.

STATEMENTS OF HON. JOHN BUELL SNYDER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA; AND HORATIO S. AGSTER, GENERAL MANAGER, PENNSYLVANIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

FARM BUREAU FEDERATION IN PENNSYLVANIA

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Snyder, of Pennsylvania, is here, together with the general manager of the Farm Bureau Federation in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Snyder, we will be glad to hear you.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is quite a privilege that you give me and my friend to appear here this morning.

I would not appear here had it not been for some few things that were said in the hearings before the Deficiency Appropriations Committee of which I am a member in the House on the farm labor program bill.

My State seems to have been ignored as a farm State and, inasmuch as Pennsylvania happens to be the sixth State, over all, in farm production, producing products that people eat, I thought we ought to be represented some way.

Senator MCCARRAN. I thought that it was all coal and iron over there.

Mr. SNYDER. Somebody did say away back in the early days that we made iron and steel for a living but we farm, too, Senator.

The president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, in the hearings before the Deficiency Appropriations Committee on page 131 gave a list of what he called leaders of the American Farm Bureau in the different parts of the United States, and when he was through, I asked him this question:

> Mr. SNYDER. Where is your representative from Pennsylvania?

Meaning the representative of the Farm Bureau.

> Mr. EDWARD A. O'NEAL. Unfortunately Pennsylvania has not a farm bureau; I am sorry.

I must admit, gentlemen of the committee, that things happen so fast I did not know whether we had such an organization or not. I knew we did have one, but things happen so fast these years I thought maybe it had evaporated or been absorbed, and I decided to be discreet. I did not ask any further questions. Then I got to inquiring, and I found out that we did have a Farm Bureau Federation, but that because it did not function as this national organization wanted it to function; because they would not do the things that they wanted them to do, which our farmers thought did not fit into our particular State they ceased to be a member of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I would like your permission, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, to ask Mr. Agster some questions.

Would you give your full name and the organization you represent?

Mr. AGSTER. Horatio S. Agster.

Mr. SNYDER. What association do you represent and what is your official position?

Mr. AGSTER. General manager, Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Federation and Pennsylvania Farm Cooperative Association.

PENNSYLVANIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION NOT AFFILIATED WITH AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Senator MCCARRAN. Do you belong to the American Farm Bureau Federation?

Mr. AGSTER. No; State farm bureau federation.

Senator MCCARRAN. I see.

Mr. AGSTER. And the other is a cooperative.

Mr. SNYDER. Two organizations?

Mr. AGSTER. Two corporations.

Mr. SNYDER. Are you acquainted with the American Farm Bureau Federation?

Mr. AGSTER. Yes, sir; indeed.

Mr. SNYDER. Is your organization a part of that national organization?

Mr. AGSTER. We are not now affiliated with the American Farm Bureau.

Mr. SNYDER. I assume by that answer you were affiliated at one time?

Mr. AGSTER. Yes; I think until about 4 years ago we were affiliated with the national organization.

Mr. SNYDER. You severed your relations with that body for certain reasons?

Mr. AGSTER. Yes, sir.

REASONS FOR NONAFFILIATION WITH AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. SNYDER. Would you please state those reasons?

Mr. AGSTER. Well, our board of directors could not agree with the policies of the national organization and as a consequence; just a mutual understanding, they parted company.

Mr. SNYDER. You said "We could not agree with" their policies. What procedure is necessary as you see it in Pennsylvania to operate effectively and efficiently to help the farmers that would not apply to all the States in the Union?

Mr. AGSTER. Well, we differ primarily on two distinct matters of policy. One is that the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Federation puts its major emphasis on development of cooperative action organizations, whereby the farmers of Pennsylvania through cooperative technique help themselves rather than have somebody else help them; and secondly, we differ upon the technique of membership. In other words, our members of which we have between twelve thousand and fourteen thousands do not pay membership dues. They are members by virtue of the fact that they hold common stock in their local cooperative associations. Those two fundamental principles is where there was a difference of opinion.

OPERATION IN PENNSYLVANIA OF STATE FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. SNYDER. You say you devote your time mainly in procedures that will enable the farmers to help themselves and get on their feet

and stay on their feet. That is very interesting, and I am sure the members of this committee would like to have a brief statement of how we can get the farmers on their feet and keep them on their feet.

Mr. AGSTER. Well, we start with the premise that agriculture divides itself into three segments, from a business standpoint.

One is purchase of raw materials that go into production.

Second is production and

Third is the sale of commodities.

Now, those are fundamentals in business enterprises and we believe they apply to agriculture.

Largely agriculture has devoted its attention to one factor and that was production. Our association, our cooperative association, which was incorporated in 1934 and was made up of three local cooperative associations—I am speaking of the whole State cooperative—and it is known as a federated type of farm supply, wholesale.

ORIGINAL AND ACCUMULATED CAPITAL OF ORGANIZATION

It started with a thousand dollars in capital, and as of December 31, this year, it closed its year with a net worth of $662,000.

Mr. SNYDER. I want to ask a question on that point. You say it started with $1,000?

Mr. AGSTER. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. And closed with what?

Mr. AGSTER. $662,000; December 31.

Mr. SNYDER. Do you mean to tell me that that $662,000 difference was a saving to the farmers; that is, if they had not had the advantage of your organization that they would have been out that much more?

Mr. AGSTER. That is right, with the exception of $150,000 of preferred stock. The rest of it was entirely saved by doing for themselves the things they have always paid somebody else to do for them. In other words they went in business for themselves and thereby they could save the margin that has always gone to somebody else in the way of profit; just the same as a manufacturer saves when he sets up a purchasing department to do the job of purchasing for him.

Senator HOLMAN. What period elapsed between the beginning and last December?

Mr. AGSTER. 1935 was the beginning of business. It has been an 8-year period.

NUMBER OF LOCAL ASSOCIATIONS

Now, in addition to that, I think I should say in justice to the over-all jurisdiction there are now 21 local associations and they have for themselves—each local association is owned by the farmers in the locality in which it is situated.

Mr. SNYDER. You have one in Somerset County?

Mr. AGSTER. We have a very good one in Somerset County, Pa., established in 1936, as I remember—1935 or 1936.

ASSETS OF LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Senator HOLMAN. The local units also have some assets; is that true?

Mr. AGSTER. Yes. They have now over a million dollars.

Mr. SNYDER. Let us go ahead.

Mr. AGSTER. Let me illustrate by using one of the units that happens to be in Mr. Snyder's district. It was set up either in 1935 or 1936; late 1935 or early 1936; and those farmers raised about, I would say, not to exceed $4,500 to put into a farm supply business, locally, and then they associated themselves with the State wholesale. Now, they close their fiscal year as of January 31, if I remember corectly.

Mr. SNYDER. In 1943?

Mr. AGSTER. 1943; yes. Their assets are now almost $100,000.

Now, every dollar of that has been saved outside of the first $4,500 that was put in. In other words, it is just a question of taking the savings they are able to accumulate by doing their own business and plowing them back into further facilities.

Now, in the meantime, the wholesale acquired manufacturing facilities for manufacturing fertilizer, feed, paint, barn equipment, lubricating oils, feed processing, and various things that all these local associations can use. They in turn invest their money in those facilities and again you see there is a further savings made, because again they are doing something that they paid somebody else to do for them.

NUMBER OF STOCKHOLDERS IN PENNSYLVANIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. SNYDER. At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask two or three questions of the witness. How many stockholders do you have in the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. AGSTER. There are now between 12,000 and 14,000 common stockholders in the various locals.

NUMBER WHO PATRONIZE LOCAL ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. SNYDER. Can anybody patronize these local associations to which you refer?

Mr. AGSTER. Anybody, yes. Anybody can become a patron; and he becomes automatically a stockholder if he patronizes it sufficiently over any length of time, because all savings are credited to his account and as soon as he gets $10 credit a share of stock is issued and then he becomes a voting member. Of course, nobody has more than one vote, regardless of the number of shares he owns.

Mr. SNYDER. You stated that you had 12,000 stockholders?

Mr. AGSTER. Twelve to fourteen thousand.

Mr. SNYDER. But, the number of patrons is larger?

Mr. AGSTER. Around 21,000 that have partially paid for stock.

Mr. SNYDER. Your State Farm Bureau Federation evidently is not recognized by the American Farm Bureau Federation, is it?

Mr. AGSTER. Evidently not, from the record here. We are affiliated with the National Council of Farm Cooperatives here in Washington.

STEPS TAKEN IN PENNSYLVANIA TO MEET FARM-LABOR PROBLEM

Mr. SNYDER. Then, the question confronting our committee, the Deficiency Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives, and now the Deficiency committee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, is what about the farm labor in our State of Pennsylvania at this time? What if anything has your organization accomplished along that line?

Mr. AGSTER. We have been very active in trying to cooperate with all of the cooperatives and Government agencies in Pennsylvania to try to solve our own labor problems.

Mr. SNYDER. How are you getting along?

Mr. AGSTER. Well, we have made some progress on a community basis. It is just a beginning, but we have made some progress.

This labor situation in Pennsylvania is serious, so far as farm labor is concerned, and it is particularly true, of course, of the technically skilled farm operators.

LOSS OF FARM LABOR TO INDUSTRIES

Mr. SNYDER. In reference to the statement that we hear so much about through the radio, the press, and other sources criticizing the Government or General Hershey, or Mr. Paul McNutt, for taking the boys off of the farm and putting them into the Army, is that a 100 percent correct statement for them to make?

Mr. AGSTER. Well, you all know, Congressman, with the amount of industry we have in Pennsylvania there has been a serious draft of farm labor into industry and the fact is we have had a number of cases where industry has advertised specifically for men to come; and they wanted men from the farms.

Senator RUSSELL. I do not think there is any question but what industry has taken a great many more out of agriculture than the Army and the Navy.

Senator HOLMAN. And more than they need.

Mr. AGSTER. It is about 60 to 40, I would say.

Senator RUSSELL. I think it is higher than that.

Mr. SNYDER. In other words, so far as that matter is concerned, I would make this statement. I think about 65 percent of the boys who have left the farm—I mean real farmers—have gone into the factories and into industry, and 35 percent of them have gone into the armed services. As I advocated in the hearings in the House, I think that—I am sure of it after I went to England and went through the factories—that we could train in 2 months' time, half a million women in the factories to do the work that these farm boys that they took off of the farm are now doing. We could do that in 3 months' time, so that they can do the same amount of work, the same type of work, and same kind of work.

So, it is hardly consistent—I will put it that way—for us to keep complaining all of the time that our farm boys have gone into the armed services. They have gone into the factories where they have received more money than they ever dreamed of seeing in their lifetime. Some of them have received it in a year.

Senator HOLMAN. May I repeat this observation?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Senator HOLMAN. The war industries have taken more men that is necessary to do the work that is required for their output. They have got a reservoir of idle men in these war industries.

Mr. AGSTER. Mr. Chairman, may I put one more thing into the record?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Please.

SERIOUSNESS OF PROBLEM ARISING OUT OF DIMINUTION OF GROUP SERVING BETWEEN FACTORIES AND FARMS

Mr. AGSTER. I think it is my duty to point out to this committee one thing, since we are discussing this labor problem, and that is there is going to develop within the next 6 months, unless the trend is changed, a very serious situation in this small liaison link of manpower between the factory and the farm.

Now, there is a small group of forgotten men in here who are now being called. It is really the Army this time, because we have given up that group. I am not talking about the cooperatives, but I am talking about the whole group of farm supply businesses. They have practically given up their single men. Now, they are getting down—for instance, let me illustrate it this way:

Now, five of our petroleum group truck drivers are called by their boards.

Now, we delivered last year a little over 21,000,000 gallons of fuel to the farms of Pennsylvania and those trucks delivered over 275,000 gallons per truck, and they carried it out in 5-gallon buckets, because we are not permitted to pump.

Now, that is the thing that is going to happen—I think somebody ought to be looking after it, because it only concerns a few people, and one of those things can just wreck us.

You take those 5 men out and there are 1,500 farms in Pennsylvania without a source of petroleum supply. Now somebody will say somebody else will supply them. Well, there will not be anybody else to supply them, because the equipment and manpower of other companies is not there.

Now, I just use that as an illustration that something had better be done pretty quickly about this crucial group of men, and I am not pleading our own case at all. I am pleading the general premise that if you do not get supplies from factories to farms, the farm won't function. It cannot function. And, the farmer now is in no position to use his own manpower and his own equipment to function in that gap because he is too short of manpower and too short of equipment. It cannot be done.

DEFERMENT OF ESSENTIAL FARM WORKERS

Mr. SNYDER. Let me ask you a question at this point. Is it not true that about 3 or 4 weeks ago an order was issued, I do not know whether by General Hershey or Mr. McNutt, to the effect that no more absolutely essential farmers should be taken from the farms. Is that right?

Senator RUSSELL. I saw the revised regulations which made it, as I saw it, exceedingly simple to defer a man who was an essential farm worker.

Mr. SNYDER. I did not receive that.

Mr. AGSTER. But, the local boards determine it. It is absolutely up to the local boards.

Senator RUSSELL. It depends on the local boards. I know that some local boards in my State have deferred men working in farm machinery stores, because they could not get anybody to take their places.

Mr. AGSTER. They are very wise, but that is not being done in our State. I am just pointing that out, gentlemen, as one of those things that is very necessary.

SERVICE RENDERED TO FARMERS BY STATE FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. SNYDER. My final question to you is this, Mr. Agster. As the manager of these organizations in the State of Pennsylvania as you enumerated here for how long——

Mr. AGSTER. Since 1934.

Mr. SNYDER. Would you say that they have rendered to the farmers of the State of Pennsylvania a service that is equal to that which would have been rendered if they had belonged to the greater organization, that is, the American Farm Bureau Federation?

Mr. AGSTER. Well, evidently our board thinks they are doing a better job or they would belong. That was a question of action on our board of directors. That was their decision. It was not management. And, the board is made up entirely of farmers, 21 of them.

Mr. SNYDER. I will close with saying this, Mr. Chairman: My people live in Somerset County, Pa., one of the 3 or 4 outstanding farm counties in the State of Pennsylvania, of the 67, and while I am not acquainted with the technique of the procedure of this organization, I know something of the Grange, and I know something of farming. I was born and raised on a farm. I worked on a farm when I was a young man, teaching school; but I gather that these groups Mr. Agster represents are doing an excellent work. They are doing far beyond what is being done in my neighbor State of New York, under a different set-up.

Thank you.

Senator RUSSELL. We are glad to have had you gentlemen here this morning.

Senator HOLMAN. May I ask where is the application of this testimony to this bill? I am extremely interested in this testimony and congratulate the local organization on the wonderful achievements they have made, but just what application does it have to this bill?

Mr. SNYDER. I meant to have it applied to two points only; first, in the express reference to farm labor, and second to bring into the hearings a statement to offset what Mr. O'Neal said before the House subcommittee, that Pennsylvania did not have a farm bureau, in referring to farmers.

I thank you.

Mr. AGSTER. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

STATEMENT OF F. R. BETTON, REPRESENTING THE SOUTHERN TENANT FARMERS UNION, COTTON PLANT, ARK.

Mr. BETTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee——

Senator RUSSELL. Who do you represent here?

Mr. BETTON. I am representing the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union in the interest of this bill that is before the committee now.

Senator RUSSELL. You have a prepared statement?

Mr. BETTON. I have got a prepared statement, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, which I would like to read.

Senator RUSSELL. You may proceed.

WILLINGNESS OF SOUTHERN NEGRO FARM LABOR TO WORK WHERE NEEDED

Mr. BETTON. I am here on behalf of several thousand Negro farm laborers who are organized in the Southern Tenant Farmers Union. Many of these workers are employed on the cotton farms only a short time each year. In the spring, beginning about May 20, there is work for them chopping cotton. This work lasts about 6 weeks and then these folks have nothing to do until September when the cotton picking starts. This work lasts for 70 or 80 days and then they are out of work until the following spring—about 5½ months. These people of my race are willing to work and would like to go where their labor is needed.

In the town of Cotton Plant, Ark., there are 380 men and women who every year work out on the cotton plantations as day hands. Their living is made by working only a third of their time. These people were glad when it became possible last November to go out to help harvest the long-staple cotton crop in Arizona. Later on in January some of them were also sent out by the Farm Security Administration to help harvest vegetables in Florida. I helped get these workers out and if it had not been for certain interests who feared that they would not return many more would have gone out. Fortunately however, all who were sent out to help the Government have returned home.

Senator RUSSELL. You mean every one of the 380?

Mr. BETTON. Every one; all of them returned back to do the job at home and when they had finished the job at home, then they are willing to go anywhere.

Senator RUSSELL. Do you have any information as to any other locality other than Cotton Plant?

Mr. BETTON. There are lots of them idle, gentlemen.

All who were sent out by the Farm Security Administration and others who did not get to go out are interested now in getting work some place. They are all afraid of what this farm labor bill will do. As they see it they will be forced to stay right where they are now and continue to depend on only a few weeks work each year. They all want to help win the war first by doing the work there at home, and helping in other areas after they have finished up their usual jobs.

Some of the younger farm workers fearing that they will be frozen for the duration in the county they now live in, a few have refused to accept deferment and have gone on into the Army. They know they can be of more service to their country in the Army than they can by

staying at home and working only a third of the time. Also $50 per month is more than they can earn working on the farms for such short period of time.

POSSIBLE EFFECT OF PENDING MEASURE

In other sections of the South that I know Negro workers of draft age are also leaving the farm because they fear they are going to be forced to remain there. It seems to me that this legislation now before your committee will defeat the purpose for which it is intended. Instead of supplying and distributing farm labor, workers will be frozen and sealed where they are now.

In the city of Memphis, Tenn., 8,000 to 10,000 seasonal farm workers who ordinarily leave that city every day to work in nearby cotton plantations in Arkansas and Mississippi during both the chopping and picking season, may well be prevented from going out to work this year's cotton crop if this bill is passed in its present form.

In southeast Missouri which is a new cotton-growing section many workers are already leaving the farms for the towns and cities. This area depends on extra labor during the cotton-picking season to harvest the crop. The workers they need also come down from the hill sections of Tennessee, Kentucky, and Arkansas when their own little cotton crops are picked out. If the bill is passed it's my opinion that some of the people who now think they want it adopted will be the hardest hit by the provisions they have insisted on it containing.

I hope that you gentlemen will take these matters into consideration and revise the legislation before you. I trust that you will give the Department of Agriculture enough funds to do the job of supplying the Nation's farms with labor needed to plant, cultivate, and harvest the crops needed to win the war. On behalf of the Negro farm people of my section I wish to say that we stand ready to do our part in this program. We will go anywhere the Government needs our labor. The Negro has more to lose by a victory by Chancellor Hitler than any other race.

Thank you.

Senator RUSSELL. What business are you engaged in?

Mr. BETTON. I am engaged in the farming business and am vice president of the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union.

Senator RUSSELL. That is the next question I was going to ask you.

REASON FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION DID NOT RECRUIT MORE LABOR IN VICINITY OF COTTON PLANT, ARK.

Did the Farm Security Administration get all of the labor that they wanted to get in your area?

Mr. BETTON. No, sir; they did not get all of the labor they wanted to get in my area last year, due to the fact that a goodly number of my people wanted to go, but somehow or other, propaganda got out that if they went out on these jobs they had to sign up for the duration and they could not come back home and carry on their work there at home, and a goodly number of them would not go on that account. So when some did go out—a few went out—why, there are others now who are anxious now and want to go, whenever the job is accomplished at home.

Senator RUSSELL. I live in an area which is a cotton section, but has comparatively small farms, and I do not exactly understand the farm work you refer to in your area. You say that the farm workers work only a third of the year. Where I live, the men in the family work almost the whole year. They have to plant the crop, and then they and the women and children chop it out. Then the men plow it and lay it by, and in the fall, the men and the women folks and children in the family very largely pick the cotton.

Of course, some of the colored people and a good many white people live in town and do move out to the farms to help in the picking season. At least, they go out every day. They are taken to the farms in trucks. However, large numbers of people live on the farms. Of course, there are also those who get employment during the chopping season and the picking season.

Mr. BETTON. What I had reference to here was this particular labor living in the small towns and cities.

Senator RUSSELL. I see.

Mr. BETTON. And, the tenants living out on the farm. That is a very small percentage of those people who would be in a position to go out and do any work anyway; but I am mainly speaking here of this major group that we have as seasonal workers in the South.

AGENCY RECRUITING FARM LABOR

Senator RUSSELL. Who recruited these people where they were recruited, the Farm Security Administration or the United States Employment Service?

Mr. BETTON. They were recruited by the Farm Security Administration and the United States Employment Service, and we cooperated with them and helped them.

INDIVIDUALS BELONGING TO SOUTHERN TENANT FARMERS UNION

Senator HAYDEN. I think there would be a distinction, Mr. Chairman, between a man who is strictly a tenant and had a contract with the landlord or say a sharecropper or a farm that he and his family could handle himself. He is under a contract with the landlord that he will plant, cultivate, and pick this crop, and they will divide the proceeds.

The title of your organization would indicate that the tenant farmer group is the group that belongs to this organization, called the Southern Tenant Farmers Union; but if the man lives in town and merely goes out to work for wages on the farm without any share in the crop, how is he considered a tenant farmer? That is what I am disturbed about.

Mr. BETTON. You see he is a laborer; a tenant laborer.

Senator HAYDEN. He has no contract with no one and he would be a laborer?

Mr. BETTON. He has no contract whatever.

Senator HAYDEN. The term "tenant" implies that he has a contract. That is what puzzled me.

Mr. BETTON. Let us admit that it does imply a contract; but this particular labor comes under this bill as well as the individual who lives out on the farm, and I am speaking of these people to the extent that they lie there and pine away these 5½ months of the year.

USE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE LISTS IN RECRUITMENT OF FARM LABOR

Senator RUSSELL. I think that Senator Hayden's question is prompted by the fact that we had some testimony here this morning to the effect that in certain areas in my own State, that the United States Employment Service has gotten the record of those who have registered for the draft, and they wrote letters to those who had a farm background, saying that they had noticed that their questionnaire showed they had a farm background, and for them to come into the United States Employment Office. The testimony further showed that these people were regular tenant farmers. Some of them worked on the halves, some on a third and fourth, and some of them were paying straight rent. They were told that they would have to either go to Florida and work there or else they would be drafted into the Army. I think that is what Senator Hayden had in mind in connection with this question.

Now, I can see very plainly that where a contractual relation exists between a landowner and a tenant or a sharecropper that that is a relationship we ought to hestitate very gravely about disturbing. On the other hand, if a man is a free laborer in town and his services are available to anybody who wants to hire him, and he cannot find work in the country surrounding that place, and he can go somewhere else, I cannot see any harm, especially in these times when he cannot transport himself due to a lack of gasoline and rubber, in the Government assisting in his transportation to another place where he can get work and also where he is needed.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think that a laborer who has not contracted his time to another is free all of the time to go any place where he can do the best for himself.

OBJECTION TO PROVISION REQUIRING CONSENT FOR MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

Senator HAYDEN. What part of this bill do you object to that you say freezes the laborers in the county where they reside?

Mr. BETTON. He cannot get transportation to any other place unless he gets permission from the county agent.

Senator HAYDEN. You think in your own county that your own county agent knowing that these men who are not needed for a part of the year still would tell them to stay there and not leave?

Mr. BETTON. Well, quite naturally they would be held possibly an unreasonable time, so much so, until it would be too late then for them to go out.

May it be understood there that a goodly percentage of people right on the farm live on the farm have some time that they might go out and help harvest some of these vegetable crops. And in my particular area, in the rural districts, we will have a goodly percentage of people who live right on the farm, where there are two or three plow hands in one family, and since most farms are being mechanized now, we have possibly a good percentage of several families in the rural areas on farms who could go help do the job.

But I am of the opinion that there would not be much moving out under this bill as passed by the House.

Senator RUSSELL. All right. Any further questions? Thank you.

Mr. BETTON. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF EDGAR G. BROWN, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL NEGRO COUNCIL, AND PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

INCLUSION IN JOINT RESOLUTION OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee.

Senator RUSSELL. Will you give your name to the reporter?

Mr. BROWN. Edgar G. Brown, director, National Negro Council and president of the United Government Employees.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, may I call your attention briefly to page 6 of the bill as it passed the House. As you probably know the original bill did not include the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. We would like, also, to include the Virgin Islands.

The people of the Virgin Islands speak English and would not have to have an interpreter as others contemplated in this legislation. They, too, are anxious to do their bit in the war effort. They have not been able to enlist in the Army as Puerto Ricans and have not been able to enter any branch of the armed services, they would consider. This action by your committee would afford them a long sought opportunity to make a timely contribution in the Government's all-out farm production program.

Formerly there were two or three C. C. C. camps down there to assist in the dire unemployment situation. They have been utilized in building a submarine base and other military construction; but now there are quite a few youngsters and older persons who are available and they make excellent farmers. The Department of Agriculture for years has maintained an experimental station there, as you know. They have had an excellent opportunity for training in modern agriculture.

Senator RUSSELL. You think that there is a surplus of labor in the Virgin Islands?

Mr. BROWN. That is my information; yes, sir.

They are not as you know, a self sustaining people. The Islands are an expensive asset to the United States. Annual appropriations are still necessary, with insufficient sources of reciprocal revenue. If they get up here, those who could be given employment in the States would become self-sustaining and make an imperative contribution at the same time.

Senator Hayden no doubt is familiar with the whole picture. He has had charge of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee handling the Territories.

QUESTION AS TO WHY NATIVES OF VIRGIN ISLANDS CAN NOT ENLIST IN THE ARMY

Senator HAYDEN. I am at a loss to understand why they cannot join the Army.

Mr. BROWN. I have made every effort to find out. I do not understand it. It does not seem that they want members of the Territories, and yet the Puerto Ricans are in the Army in large numbers.

Senator HAYDEN. Is there any law that prohibits them, or is it just a matter that the Army does not want them?

Mr. BROWN. Well, sir, I believe it is covered by Section 15–B of the Selective Service Act of 1940, which excludes or does not include the Virgin Islands.

Senator HAYDEN. What is the status of a native of the Virgin Islands. Is he an American citizen?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; he can vote if he comes here; but the Democratic Party—if I may refer to that—they recognize them, I believe, as delegates to the Democratic National Convention from the Virgin Islands, but the Republican Party does not. It is rather parodoxical.

Senator HAYDEN. The Puerto Ricans by law are declared to be American citizens. A Hawaiian-born person is an American citizen and free to come to the United States and stay and do anything that any other citizen can do. Is there any restriction which prevents the natives of the Virgin Islands coming to the United States if they could find a way of getting here?

Mr. BROWN. Not to my knowledge, aside from the boat or plane fare. He is an American citizen, if the gets here, and is entitled to appointment to certain number of civil-service positions under the apportionment act.

Senator HOLMAN. He is qualified to remain here if he comes. He is an American citizen all over the world.

Mr. BROWN. He does not vote for President.

Senator HAYDEN. He does not vote in Puerto Rico either.

Senator HOLMAN. It is a Territory.

Senator HAYDEN. The only question that I was asking was the reason they are not permitted to enlist in the Army. If the Army needs soldiers and wants them, it seems that they could be enlisted. So far as employing them, they can use them in labor battalions and things like that. Apparently, the Army could use them in Panama or any place that they are needed.

What is the advantage in including Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Alaska in the bill? As I understand the purpose of the bill is to provide farm labor where needed. There is supposed to be a surplus of farm labor in Puerto Rico; there is a surplus in the Virgin Islands, and there ought to be a surplus in Hawaii now with the situation as it is.

Was it the purpose of the amendment that by adding these insular possessions to the bill that money would be available to bring people from those places to the United States?

Senator RUSSELL. I think that was it.

Senator HAYDEN. Otherwise, they could not finance their transportation to the United States.

Senator RUSSELL. I think that is correct.

Senator HOLMAN. I see no harm in including the Virgin Islands.

Senator NYE. I do not see why the Virgin Islands should not be included likewise.

PROVISION REQUIRING CONSENT FOR MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

Mr. BROWN. Thank you very much. There is another matter in this bill, I do not know whether it falls within the legislative authority. Many colored people are greatly disturbed over the language on page 4 giving authority to the county agents to determine whether or not there is a surplus labor supply at a given time.

I think the committee would be interested to do anything that can be done to get the full-hearted support of farm workers back of the program, aside from appropriating the necessary funds. I believe if you would indicate that the new Food Administrator, Mr. Davis, in whom we must now repose considerable confidence, or some other such official in the Department, could review the findings of the county agent or the State agricultural representative, as to whether there is the surplus of farm labor or not in these respective counties.

You can appreciate that the county agents and the local people are only human after all, like all the rest of us. They would not knowingly be unpatriotic, but they might be tempted to hoard farm workers looking forward to the time when the farmers of the country needed labor.

We have been impressed with the success that has attended the moving of a number of colored workers into New Jersey, a certain season of the year to aid in marketing the perishable crops. They have been able to do that work. They have been moved back and forth for years. In other words, Senator Russell, I am sure knows that the Negro labor in the South is quite often idle a large part of the year. There certainly is no reason at this time why we should not utilize their unusually fine skills and long experience in this agricultural field. I think the language put in by the House limits unduly the administrative discretion, which is absolutely necessary to expedite the demands of the 1943 program. It is only natural, as has been suggested, the local people would not be too anxious for anybody to be moved away from his district fearful that he might not return. I am sorry there is not a copy of the Life magazine of last week here. It shows some of my people won the ham prize contest in Peach County, Ga., for producing the finest and best this year. You probably noted the two pages of pictures of these proud colored farmers and producers.

Senator RUSSELL. I did see it, but I did not know that they were related to you.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir. We just got one of the hams yesterday; trying to get under the O. P. A. wire; and some nice salt pork which you can use to season vegetables was included. You cannot get it on the market here.

There are great untapped sources of patriotism and industry far too long inhibited in the colored people of the South and North. They want to enter into this total war effort, but I think this language may be construed by the Negro press in such a way perfectly honest, but nevertheless it will dampen their ardor and enthusiasm for the cause. They feel it is a limitation on their constitutional rights and I am constrained to feel it would be most unfortunate at this time. There should be equality of treatment today above everything else. It does not seem fair to authorize just one person the right to refuse them the privilege of leaving, if they are not needed, or dissatisfied, and the victory farm program better served by their labor's elsewhere than the present county in which they are presently residing. I believe a review of the local findings should be provided through the administrator of the Department of Agriculture. I think it ought to be reviewed by someone, and a determination made based upon what the needs that

may be dictated from a consideration of the over-all picture. The average county agents would not know the over-all picture of the national situation as to farm labor and the place of greatest need. Senator Russell and others here really know the conditions in the South and know that there are a great many Negroes who are not employed to the fullest capacity. I have been there recently, and I, too, know this is true. You see them standing around in the railroad stations and on the streets. It only adds to a more acute delinquency problem.

Senator RUSSELL. I do not think that it is as bad as it was down there. Of course, in ordinary times, we do have it around the small towns, particularly, but not on the farms. Those who live on the farms get employment most of the year but around the towns there is a large number who work only a part of the time usually gathering the crops.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. I do not think there is as big a surplus as there has been.

Mr. BROWN. Well, there are quite a few youngsters yet, as you probably know, because I took particular note of it when I was with the C. C. C. They are not either in the Army or engaged in other gainful and essential work.

I believe it would be good for the country to get them in a job all the year round, if it necessitates moving them back and forth and I think they should be given first consideration over all others from outside the country. They are American citizens.

We are not for the compulsory manpower program but at the same time since there is need for food at this time and since these people are available, quite anxious and willing to do their bit nothing should be put in their way by Congress. I am afraid that the county agents would be too generous in winking at their idleness. You know certain people are so kind hearted, they do not have the stamina to take advantage of anybody, for their own good and the befriended.

There is an imperative need for the services of these people all of the year around and there is certainly need for a lot of them in 1943 to produce more and more food. They could be moved to Florida and from Florida on up to New Jersey in the berry season, and we would get the full benefit of this labor. It is the only really untapped labor we have for the most part neglected.

If you could modify the language on page 4 or add that there should be a review at least made by the administrator of the local and State findings, it would meet more constructively, in my judgment, the purposes of this act. On page 2, there is a statement about line 4 in connection with the extension work and apportionment to the States on the basis of need. I thought if you could insert language that, in the determination of need, there should be no discrimination on account of race, color or creed—similar language which is in the Constitution. At the same time it needs to be pointed out in this particular legislation. It would go far to get the Negro press back of the program and this is almost equally important. I can visualize such headlines as "Great opportunity to serve your

country on the farms, North and South; the Army needs colored farmers and workers. Senate protects your rights to work without discrimination." There would be the fullest accomplishments of the objectives of this legislation. It would certainly be highly encouraging to all the 13,000,000 colored people and it would greatly benefit over 7,000,000 fighting men and allies everywhere.

Senator RUSSELL. That is the only benefit I can possibly think of that might flow from that. It had not occurred to me, because nearly all who have been transported have been colored people.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLMAN. You think that it would have a wholesome psychological effect to have that language in?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir, absolutely. There is no question about it. Incidentally, the Senate Civil Service Committee just voted favorably on the overtime pay increase bill report, to include language prohibiting discrimination in the navy yards by the machinists and metal trades unions, that maintain a closed shop, and have denied Negroes, over the years, membership to these organizations, benefiting by federal legislation. The unions wish to continue getting all of the benefits from the discrimination business as usual and still condemn others for such attitudes and practices. We have got nearly 20,000 or 30,000 colored workers who have worked as apprentices for 5 or 10 years and have got the skills but the Nation needs them most, the unions have been increasing their opposition. No other workers are available for this necessary employment. We need more of them in the shipyards and navy yards, yet they are not permitted to use their skills by the machinists or the metal trades unions. So we suggested that they ought to be denied the benefits of overtime and pay unless all American workers under the United States civil service laws were given an equal opportunity to use their skills. The Senate Committee felt that here we wanted to utilize the manpower and they voted to grant these rights and the opportunity to release 30,000 or 40,000 people to put everything into the building of more and more ships. This is the same situation presented by this farm workers legislation.

Senator RUSSELL. Do you know of any discrimination against any Negro in the operation of this program up to now?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir; and this language will point it up for the future. I know your position, as to the farmers and the men in the service, Senator Russell. It has been most helpful and encouraging. We are asking only your continued good offices to get the best from every American, today. We have those individuals who would capitalize upon any possible trouble-making interpretation. We are merely trying to anticipate the administration of this law, so that we can get a constructive reaction and response. We sincerely wish further to encourage the good will which you have so often mentioned, Senator Russell, which is the only way to unity of all the people in these trying days.

Senator RUSSELL. Does that conclude your statement?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; and thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

Senator RUSSELL. All right. This will close the hearings so far as the witnesses are concerned.

TELEGRAM TO SENATOR BONE RELATIVE TO PROVISION REQUIRING CONSENT FOR MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

Senator RUSSELL. I will offer for the record a telegram from the director of agriculture of the State of Washington to Senator Bone, insisting that the provision which provides that the county agent must sign before any work can be recruited makes the bill unworkable.

(The telegram referred to is as follows:)

OLYMPIA, WASH., *March 24, 1943.*

Senator HOMER T. BONE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Understand resolution appropriating 26 millions passed House for handling farm labor with amendment providing that county agents where recruitment is undertaken must sign statement indicating surplus of workers in his area before recruitment undertaken. Bill vital but amendment unworkable. Request your consideration deleting amendment.

ARTHUR E. COX,
Director of Agriculture.

LETTER TO SENATOR MCKELLAR FROM MR. C. E. BREHM

[See p. 100.]

Senator RUSSELL. I will also offer for the record at this point a letter to Senator McKellar from Mr. C. E. Brehm, director of the agricultural extension service in Tennessee.

(The letter referred to follows:)

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK,
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, STAFF OF TENNESSEE,
KNOXVILLE, TENN., *March 25, 1943.*

HON. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR, I was in Washington Tuesday of this week with Mr. Ed. O'Neal and several other extension directors appearing before the Senate Finance Committee about H. J. Res. 96, the House resolution placing responsibility with the Agricultural Extension Service for assisting farmers in meeting farm labor problems and appropriating monies for such assistance.

I went by your office but you were out due to illness. Have understood that you have been sick for several weeks. I hope you will take care of yourself, and wish for you a full and complete recovery at the earliest possible date.

I know with the many responsibilities you have had that it has been a great physical strain; however, it is times like these that the country needs leadership of the kind you have exercised in the Senate for so many years.

The matter I wanted to discuss with you briefly was the farm labor situation, with several suggestions as to how I thought some phases of it might be met, or at least some of the various phases ameliorated somewhat. The committee spent considerable time talking about the importation of Mexican labor. The original bill in the House contemplated funds to assist with the importation of 50,000 Mexican laborers. There is no question but that Mexican labor in some of the States in the West and bordering on Mexico is important in those States, but when we consider that there are approximately 6½ million farms in the United States and that approximately 3 to 3½ million farm hands have left these farms, it is apparent that Mexican or even migratory labor is of very minor significance in meeting the basic fundamental labor problems of the vast majority of the farms in the United States.

There are two basic or fundamental phases of this farm labor problem: First, skilled or labor that can plow, handle a tractor or get the land ready for planting and plant the crop, or look after and feed the stock. This is labor to be effective that must understand local conditions largely in the community or

neighborhood. In other words the most satisfactory kind of labor is that which is most familiar with the soil type, when the ground is in the right condition to plow and the crop adaptation of various soils and farming practices in the community. This is the farmers' most important labor problem and it is self evident that Mexican or migratory labor cannot meet this phase of the farm labor problem.

A farmer can plow and prepare for seeding far more land than he can sow and harvest from at seasonal periods of the year. This brings on the second phase of the problem—labor for peak labor periods, sowing some crops for example, planting tobacco, chopping cotton, picking strawberries, getting in hay, harvesting vegetable crops. It is at such times the farmer needs extra labor for a few days or weeks at certain seasons of the year. It is here the seasonal or migratory labor fits in the picture. This is the type of labor that most farmers in Tennessee are most concerned about right now.

It would not be possible to set forth in this letter all the detailed explanations of the problem and remedies therefor. They are rather complex. I am persuaded, however, that the farmers' major labor problems are not going to be solved by moving migratory labor over the country. This will contribute to relieving the labor situation only to a very minor degree and in relatively few localities. On the contrary these labor problems are going to have to be met in the neighborhoods or communities by the farmers with the most effective mobilization of the man and woman power and machine power that is there. This means farmers exchanging labor with each other to a greater degree than hitherto; manpower on small farms not employed full time hiring out to or helping the larger surplus producing farms; small farmers on subsistence farms being placed on larger surplus producing farms; placement of men coming back from war industries (and they are coming back) on surplus producing farms; the most efficient use of tractor power for plows, combines, etc., so it is busy the maximum number of hours during the day time and with lights for night work. This is being done. For example a man has a tractor that he has work for 4 or 5 days himself, when it is not in use on his own farm he should do custom plowing for his neigbbor. This, and in other ways, is the manner in which the first phase of this farm labor problem will be met by the majority of the farmers in the United States.

The second phase of the problem does not require such skilled labor. Much of this labor can be recruited in the neighborhood if it is organized and mobilized properly. For example, we have in this State approximately 80,000 4-H Club boys and girls with farm background. These boys and girls can be utilized to pick berries, harvest vegetable crops, and do much other seasonal work that does not require a lot of skilled work. But even most of these are well skilled in farm chores. Many are being taught to operate tractors, etc. Then in addition there are many other boys and girls in the high schools, Boy Scouts, etc., that can be called on for this kind of work. We are already making plans to meet some of these problems in your State in this way. We may as well be realistic about this thing. These problems are going to be met and if there is any solution it is going to be largely in the counties and neighborhoods where the farms and the manpower is. After all, every State has about the same problem and moving people from place to place creates a greater scarcity of labor in one and for temporary expediency in another.

H. J. Res. 96 provides for delegating responsibility to a large degree to county agents and the extension services of the several States for assisting farmers with these labor problems. Personally, I think the county agents with some assistance in the county, can help greatly the farmers meeting these problems if they are told they have this responsibility. There could be set up a county farm labor office under the county agent where labor in the county could be recruited and a farmer get help if any help was available. The extension services, while not seeking this job, are perfectly willing to do it if Congress wants them to and I think could be of material help. In any event to eliminate the confusion about this whole farm labor matter, there should be one place or office in the county where the farmer can go and get some help. As matters are at present there are announcements in the papers that the farmer should contact the Farm Security Administration representative about his farm labor problems. Another says, "See the U. S. Employment Service representative," another says, "See the county United States Department of Agriculture war board." Yet all the farmers go to the county agent. The Agricultural Extension Service

has made no statements despite the fact we are going ahead helping them because we have had no desire to further add to the confusion. I do think it important, however, that this work be delegated to some agency with definite responsibility given to go ahead and assist farmers in every possible way, in meeting these labor problems. This is urgent. For this reason I hope the Senate Appropriations Committee will act promptly on H. J. Res. 96, delegate this duty to some agency and instruct the agency to help farmers in a practical way to meet as far as possible their labor problems. This food situation can be pretty critical before the year is over.

Yours very truly,

C. E. BREHM, *Director.*

CEB/mr

TELERGAM TO SENATOR FERGUSON FROM REPRESENTATIVES OF SUGAR-BEET INDUSTRY IN MICHIGAN

Senator RUSSELL. Senator Ferguson of Michigan has submitted for the committee's consideration the following telegrams, which will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The telegrams referred to follow:)

IMLAY CITY, MICH., *March 19, 1943.*

Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Resolution passed by the Eastern Michigan Growers' Association, Imlay City, Mich. Two hundred growers present March 17, 1943. Whereas, the farmers and producers of eastern Michigan are faced with a critical labor shortage and vital war crops are threatened, be it

Resolved, That our Congressmen be wired to the effect that immediate action must be taken by Congress or the crop program will have to be reduced 50 percent unless funds are allotted for transportation of migratory workers. Crop plans must be made within the next 3 weeks. The members of the Eastern Michigan Growers' Association are willing to help win this war and pay the workers. Their only request that Congress appropriate the funds for transportation of workers.

MARINUS VANDENBERG,
President, Eastern Michigan Growers Association.

DETROIT, MICH., *March 23, 1943.*

Hon. HOMER S. FERGUSON,

Senate Office Building:

Respectfully suggest that you oppose enactment of the Pace amendment to House Joint Resolution No. 96 as being unfair and unjust to beet-sugar industry.

GREAT LAKES SUGAR CO.

MOUNT CLEMENTS, MICH., *March 25, 1943.*

Senator HOMER FERGUSON,

Senate Bldg:

Pace amendment to House Joint Resolution No. 96 would seriously interfere with getting enough labor out of Texas to take care of beets in Michigan and other similar crops recommend the amendment be stricken from the bill.

FRANKLIN COUNTY SUGAR CO.,
Mount Clemens, Mich.

MENOMINEE, MICH., *March 24, 1934.*

Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We understand amendment has been added to House Joint Resolution 96 to the effect that no part of funds to be appropriated shall be expended for transportation of any worker from county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside such county, without prior consent in writing of county extension agent of such county or for transportation of any worker outside the limits of the State where he resides or is working, without prior consent in writing of the Commissioner of Agriculture or other official who performs similar functions for such State. May we ask, you use every effort to have this amendment stricken from the bill as it would be detrimental to the interests of farmers growing sugar beets and would make it impossible to carry out its instructions as labor will have to be moved from Texas within the next couple of weeks.

SUPERIOR SUGAR REFINING CO.,
LUDWIG.

SUBSTITUTE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

(See pp. 141, 142, and 145)

(The following was submitted by Mr. Robert Handschin, National Farmers Union:)

SUBSTITUTE PROPOSED BY NATIONAL FARMERS UNION FOR H. J. RES. 96

JOINT RESOLUTION Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for expenses necessary for the formulation, development, and execution, under the supervision and direction of the Food Administrator, and either independently or in cooperation with individuals or agencies, public or private, of a plan to assist in providing an adequate supply and distribution of labor, including sharecroppers and tenants (including aliens), for the production of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, including (1) recruiting, placement, and transportation of such labor within the continental United States and elsewhere, including transportation of their families and household effects; (2) furnishing, by loans, grants, or otherwise, of medical services, training, subsistence, and shelter; (3) construction or lease and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services; (4) investigation of farm wages; (5) studies to simplify agricultural operations for the purpose of reducing labor requirements and the demonstration to farmers of such simplified operations; (6) employment of persons (including aliens) and organizations, by contract or otherwise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (7) acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; (8) purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; (9) printing and binding; (10) travel expenses of persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating capacities from a foreign country to the United States and return, including such expenses to first-duty stations; there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $58,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943.

(a) *Provided,* That not less than $9,000,000 of the appropriation herein shall be allocated for use by or under the direction of the Federal Extension Service, not less than $500,000 of which to be available to the Director of the Office of Extension Service, for mobilization of local labor resources for local seasonal farm employment and transfers may be made, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, from $49,000,000 of this appropriation to any bureau or office of the Department of Agriculture, or to any other agency of the Government, which is assigned functions in connection herewith, in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944.

(b) In furtherance of the efficient utilization of migratory domestic farm labor and notwithstanding any provision of this or other law, funds from this

appropriation or heretofore appropriated or made available to the Department of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor, may be used to determine, establish, fix, or impose (1) prevailing wages based upon time or piece rates, whichever is customary, (2) minimum employment guarantees of 85 percent of the possible workdays (exclusive of one day in each seven consecutive possible workdays and of other days upon which adverse weather conditions prevent work), for the enforcement of which guarantees and only for such enforcement hourly or daily wage rates instead of customary piece rates may be determined, established, and imposed, and (3) housing, sanitation, and other standards for the improvement and maintenance of the health and efficiency of the workers and their families.

(c) Housing standards may be determined and established as a condition of placement of nonmigratory seasonal or year-round domestic farm labor recruited, transported, and placed under this program.

(d) Notwithstanding any provision of this or other law such funds may be used to determine, establish, or impose, by agreement with farmers and other employers of migratory farm labor, such wage, employment, housing, sanitation, and other standards and conditions for labor imported from foreign countries as may be necessary to obtain such labor.

(e) No part of any such funds shall be used to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements of union membership with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of section 3 (f), 7 (c), and 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

(f) The existing county and state farm labor supply committees shall advise upon the supply and demand for labor in their county or state and upon the activities under this program being conducted or to be conducted in their county or state, including receiving and submitting complaints concerning this program.

(g) The Food Production Administrator may organize under such regulations as he may prescribe such organizations as may be deemed necessary, to be known as Volunteer Land Armies, each composed exclusively of migratory workers, women, or youth, and membership in such organizations shall be through voluntary enlistment for a period of one year or less.

(h) Whenever labor shall be furnished hereunder to any other agency, public or private, or individual, this appropriation shall be reimbursed for expenditures on account of wages paid to such labor and other expenditures in connection therewith to the extent which the Secretary may determine to be practicable.

(i) Any persons employed by the United States as farm labor under this program shall not be entitled to any compensation under the Act of September 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 751 ff.), as amended.

(j) No head taxes shall be levied or collected under section 132 of Title 12 of the United States Code upon the admission of aliens to this country under this program.

(k) Any payments made by the United States or private employers to aliens under this program or under any program financed with funds heretofore appropriated or made available to the Department of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(l) Effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3 of the Act of June 29, 1936 (40 U. S. C. 433), receipts derived for the account of the United States from the use and occupancy of labor supply centers, including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(m) Former Civilian Conservation Corps camps where suitably located shall be made available to the extent required to workers recruited under this program and shall be operated by the Food Administrator so long as required for the purposes of this program.

(n) Expenditures may be made hereunder without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes.

Senator RUSSELL. If there is nothing further, the committee will adjourn subject to call.

(Thereupon, at 12:05 p. m., Friday, March 26, 1943, the committee adjourned subject to call.)

FARM LABOR PROGRAM, 1943

TUESDAY, MARCH 30, 1943

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 3:30 p. m., in the committee room of the Committee on Appropriations, the Capitol, Hon. Richard B. Russell presiding.

Present: Senators Russell, Hayden, Tydings, Overton, Thomas of Oklahoma, McCarran, O'Mahoney, Bankhead, Nye, Holman, and Brooks.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHESTER C. DAVIS, ADMINISTRATOR OF FOOD PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION

Senator RUSSELL. Gentlemen of the committee, we have had extensive hearings on House Joint Resolution 96. Since the hearings started, Mr. Davis has been appointed to the position of Food Production and Distribution Administrator, and the duties with which the resolution deals have been placed in his hands. Mr. Davis has just reached Washington and, naturally, has had no time to fix policies. It is somewhat of an imposition on him, perhaps, to ask him up here. But I knew the members of the committee would want to meet Mr. Davis and get his views, generally speaking, on this resolution, insofar as he has been able to inform himself in respect thereto.

We appreciate your coming up here, Mr. Davis, and would like to have any suggestions you may care to make to the committee.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know much about the details of the pending bill. I sat up last night to read the bill and the report to get the feel of it a little bit. What I would like to do is to make some general comments confined pretty much to principles and not to details, and then counsel with the committee on anything the committee wants to go into—except that I would flunk any kind of an examination on the details of it.

EFFECT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96 AS PASSED BY HOUSE

I haven't had a chance to talk to the men in the Department. So my first impression about House Joint Resolution 96, my own impression, is that it ties the hands of an administrator rather inflexibly. By that I mean it seems to be appropriating the funds exclusively to the Extension Service, the Extension Service in the De-

partment, and the Extension Service in the States, leaving a small administrative sum for the central Office of Extension.

PROGRAM SHOULD BE BUILT AROUND EXTENSION SERVICE AT COUNTY AND STATE LEVELS

There is no question but what you have to use the Extension Service in very important ways. I don't see how anybody can attempt to run that job without practically centering it around the Extension Service at the county level; and, as far as the internal recruitment and placement of labor within the State is concerned, I should say that in most States it will probably be found that the director of extension would be the best man to take care of that.

Senator McCarran. I didn't catch the last part of that, Mr. Davis; you let your voice drop.

Mr. Davis. At the county level; it seems to me that the most practical and immediate step would be to build the program around the county agent, the Extension Service, and the same thing within the State, as far as the internal recruitment and placement of labor within the State may be concerned. There may be exceptions in some States where the Extension Service, or the college which directs the activity, may not wish to go into the labor program to the extent that may be necessary. It may be necessary to supplement their activities in some ways.

Senator McCarran. Right there, Mr. Davis, do you distinguish in this between the marshaling of labor that you now have in mind and the activity now going on which is just being set up under the War Manpower activities? The War Manpower is just now being set up, you know.

Mr. Davis. Yes.

Senator McCarran. In the West, for instance, I am familiar with this. A region is set up embracing Oregon, Washington, California, Nevada, and I think Arizona and Alaska. I use that as an illustration. The regional head is centered at San Francisco, and he in turn selects his operating force in the respective States.

Do you distinguish between that and the set-up you have in mind?

Mr. Davis. Yes. I am talking now about this bill which places some responsibility in the Department of Agriculture, but which, under the recent Executive order, would be headed my way.

Senator Russell. I think the officers you refer to, Senator McCarran, are under Mr. McNutt, in the War Manpower Commission. Isn't that correct?

Senator McCarran. I think you are correct.

Senator Russell. Mr. McNutt has referred the recruitment of farm labor to the Department of Agriculture, and that has been shifted, in turn, to Mr. Davis.

Senator McCarran. That is going to be turned over to Mr. Davis?

Senator Russell. That has already been done; and these officers to which you refer, it is my understanding, have nothing to do with this farm-labor program.

Mr. Davis. I think it is necessary to have the closest kind of cooperation between the Department and these regional offices of the War Manpower Commission.

MEASURE AS ENACTED SHOULD PERMIT USE OF WHATEVER SERVICES CAN BE MOBILIZED

I have spoken briefly of the activities at the county and State levels, where I think the services of the extension offices should be used. But I think we should be free to turn to whatever services can be mobilized, though the Extension Service can perhaps give us the best service at local levels. But this bill seems to go much further than that, in making the Extension Service almost the exclusive agency for carrying out the program within the States. This may be awkward if not unworkable in some instances.

HANDLING OF FARM LABOR IMPORTED FROM BAHAMA ISLANDS

I will go over the bill briefly. Then I am perfectly willing to tell you how I would, at this stage, plan to approach the whole problem of the mobilization of manpower.

At present we have detailed to us by the War Department Colonel Bruton, who is in charge of receiving the labor being brought in from the Bahamas for use in the Southeast. He knows how to arrange transportation and to provide for the care and the movement of imported labor up to the point where it is delivered into the State or the community where it is needed. At that point the Extension Service, under this plan, would take over and assume the responsibility of placing the labor where it is needed.

The same thing would be true in the Intermountain States and in the Southwest.

DIFFERENT ARRANGEMENT NEEDED WITH RESPECT TO IMPORTATION OF LABOR FROM MEXICO

It seems to me some different arrangement will be necessary with respect to Mexican labor than would be possible under this bill, under which apparently a number of the States—the extension directors—would have to get together, formulate a program of their own, enter into negotiations, and recruit labor. This procedure might be an awkward and backhanded way to go into the thing.

As you know, I will do the very best I can with any bill Congress enacts. However, I believe that for good administration we should have more flexibility than this House bill provides, so that we can use Extension Service for the things Extension Service is best fitted to do and supplement that with all the other departmental resources we have, as well as with those of the State Department, and so forth.

QUESTION AS TO UTILIZING FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Senator TYDINGS. Would you want it broad enough to use the F. S. A.?

Mr. DAVIS. I would want to be able to permit, for instance, the county agents to make use of some of the local F. S. A. workers, Senator. I certainly wouldn't want to turn the program over to F. S. A. to administer.

Senator TYDINGS. You would use them in the secondary capacity, and use the county agents in the primary capacity?

Mr. DAVIS. Locally, in the State, the county, and the community, that would be my thought at this stage.

COUNTY AGENTS

Senator HOLMAN. May I make a comment, Mr. Chairman, about the county agents?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLMAN. I think the county agents are probably the most useful force in the Federal Government; but they are no longer able to carry out the purposes for which they were originally organized. They are now becoming paper workers in their offices instead of operators in the field demonstrating how we may increase our production, which is most needed. I hope that in contemplating giving them more work, the provision will be made to give them larger forces and greater resources and support, so that their original functions will not be entirely destroyed.

PLANS DEVELOPED BY STATE EXTENSION SERVICES

Mr. DAVIS. Senator, I can say this, that all of the State extension services anticipating responsibilities this year have developed plans for carrying out their responsibilities along this line, and they can be put into effect just as soon as this bill is passed. And they include putting an emergency labor adviser or manager in each county agent's office to direct this; so it wouldn't be the personal duty of the agent. But I think it should continue to be his responsibility.

ELIMINATION OF FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION FROM PROGRAM

Senator HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this observation: This joint resolution as it passed the House apparently had one primary object in mind, and that was to insure absolutely that the Farm Security Administration would not have anything to do with the recruitment and placement of farm labor. To accomplish that objective the measure provides that the recruitment and placement functions shall be transferred to the Extension Service within the States.

LOCAL MOBILIZATION OF FARM LABOR THROUGH EXTENSION SERVICE WITHIN STATES

In reading the measure, members of this subcommittee became quite confused because it isn't quite clear as to how the problems involved should be handled. We have tried to break the proposition down into three phases. If the House committee is correct in its report that 90 percent of the labor that has to be obtained at harvest time must be secured within the State by this huge plan of mobilizing women and high school students, then that is a function within the State that can very properly be carried on by the Extension Service. That is the first phase of the program.

INTERSTATE MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

Then the next part of the program is the recruitment of farm labor in one part of the United States, or outside the United States, to take it to another part of the country. That obviously is a Federal function. You couldn't have any arrangements made by an association of several State agencies to do that. It just wouldn't work. The House measure evidently contemplates that that part of the program shall be handled by the United States Employment Service, although it is not clear on that point.

In the United States Employment Service, they have a farm placement agency that has been doing this kind of work. Is there any way you can pick out that part of the agency and get them under your own management so that you can do this work?

Mr. DAVIS. As I say, Senator, I don't know the details of the bill and I don't know exactly how we could reach out and get them. But I would say you want to gear them in to make use of them.

IMPORTATION OF FARM LABOR

Senator HAYDEN. Then the third phase of the problem is the importation of labor from foreign countries. The way the House passed this joint resolution, the existing agreement we have with Mexico would end in 30 days, because we directed Mexico to change the agreement, which they wouldn't do. However, you mentioned some Army officer being used to handle the recruitment and placement of labor from the Bahamas?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. If we could get that kind of an organization to take care of the importation phase of the program, it would probably be adivsable to do so.

SEPARATING VARIOUS PHASES OF FARM LABOR PROBLEM

It seems to me the problem divides into three parts, and you ought to have three organizations to handle it. Is that sound?

Mr. DAVIS. I don't think we ought to spread the lines too much. I agree with you on the first part, that the Extension Service should direct, with such aid as we can give them from the Department.

Senator HAYDEN. States like New York and California have set up by appropriative action of their legislatures agencies to help in the farm labor program, and you ought to have authority to cooperate fully with them wherever you can, shouldn't you?

Mr. DAVIS. That is right. But I don't think we should set this up in too many departments. And I think another thing in the House was the fear that another large Federal bureau would be set up to handle this thing here.

Senator HAYDEN. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS. Or some other Federal bureau would be perpetuated—and that was in the minds of those in the House as well as the Farm Security Administration.

PROVISO REQUIRING CONSENT OF COUNTY AGENTS FOR MOVEMENT OF FARM LABOR

Senator TYDINGS. Mr. Davis, if you have finished answering Senator Hayden on that point, I would like to ask you about this proviso in the joint resolution. It was adopted on the House floor and reads in part as follows [reading]:

: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, * * *

Without taking any sides in the matter myself, I would just like to ask for information whether you feel that is a wise qualification to put in the bill, or an unwise one.

Mr. DAVIS. I would consider that to be one of the kinds of provisions that would tie our hands. It is a precaution against a situation developing where a community would be raided, you see, and then find it had need there for its labor. Then, of course, there would be a big holler. But I think those are administrative responsibilities and risks we have to run, and I don't think you can possibly safeguard against all you can imagine by writing provisions into the bill—and the more you write into the bill, the less chance a fellow has to do the job.

EFFECT OF PROVISO

Senator TYDINGS. It would be possible for the county agent, due to local pressure, to refuse to release the labor to some place where it was more urgently needed? Isn't that a fair deduction?

Mr. DAVIS. I think it is, Senator.

Senator TYDINGS. So that what happens is that you get local politics, regardless of the actual labor requirements, injected into the procurement situation?

Mr. DAVIS. It seems to me it would work to prevent the flexibility and mobility of the labor you need to do the job.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ANOTHER FEDERAL BUREAU SHOULD BE AVOIDED

Senator O'MAHONEY. You were about to make some comment about what you thought appeared in the House measure, namely, the desire to avoid the establishment of another large Federal bureau.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Senator O'MAHONEY. What were you going to say about that?

Mr. DAVIS. This is just in the realm of thinking out loud, just my present stage of thinking; and you gentlemen please recognize this thing has been dumped on me for less than a week; that I only came down here yesterday to take this thing on. So there is a lot I just don't know about it, and I will realize that probably better a week or a month from now than I do at this time.

GENERAL STATEMENT ON HANDLING OF FARM-LABOR PROBLEM

But, approaching this problem, my idea would be that the first thing to do would be to find a soft-spoken, fast-moving executive who has the feel of farming and knows how the farm or ranch mind

works, who hasn't any political or other axe to grind, who would be my director of this manpower activity. He would have to be good, and fast-moving, because decisions have to be made all along the line.

In order to help Extension do the job it would have, I think we would have to find some one thoroughly familiar with the Extension Service lines of communications to the States and counties, and put him in Mr. Wilson's office here exclusively on this job, so that this man I am talking about would have that arm already set up and he could move.

As far as handling Mexican or Bahaman labor is concerned—by the way, the man I have in mind for this job would also have to be detailed to me from the Army. He is in the Army, and checked in here yesterday. I don't want to say who he is until I can get him cleared from the Army and has stuck his neck under this load. But I believe he is a good man and he will be able to give me what I want, which is a factual and unbiased attack on a very big and important job.

Now, then, under him we would have these various lines of operation, your three, you see, Senator; and then I can think of others which go along and which can be tied in probably pretty largely with Extension, but which will need a lot of fire built under them and alongside them to get it done. I refer to using the labor supply available in the towns and cities, what the people call the "land army." On that kind of work you can use the Extension a lot; but you have to have some person devoting his attention exclusively to getting it understood and getting the farmers willing to make use of that labor.

He would also have to supervise the method by which the transportation, receipt, and handling of the Mexican labor would be done, up to the time it enters the State where it would be turned over to Extension. Extension would have information as to where the need is, scattered throughout the counties; and then the placement would be made by Extension on the individual farms.

I have oversimplified this; but you see we have the responsibility, working from this end, of recruiting labor, where there might be a labor surplus, like in some parts of the Appalachian Mountains. That recruiting, it seems to me, should be a special job for which Extension should not be made responsible. I believe Extension can be made responsible for finding out where the jobs are. For bringing the labor and the jobs together we would have to have this central, Federal office, in charge of which I would like to put this man I mention.

Of course, right along with this runs the drive to build up the willingness on the part of the farmers to use the kinds of labor he hasn't used before, and getting them trained. We would have to use the Smith-Hughes vocational educational force, for example, which is doing a great deal of training of youth for this purpose. But this force is not under Extension but under the Office of Education; and we would have to have them geared in to work with us.

ADMINISTRATOR SHOULD NOT BE CONFINED TO ANY SINGLE METHOD

That is a very rough, hit-or-miss general statement. It illustrates what my general feeling is, that any man who administers this bill

should not have his hands tied to a single method, and that method itself parceled out into 48 different divisions. I think you do not have the flexibility there you want. There are detailed questions that arise.

I was handed a memorandum by the Solicitor of the Department of questions he prepared at my request. But I wouldn't be competent to add much to it beyond reading the bare list of them. I would be glad to go over some of the questions, if you like.

PROGRAM FOR A LAND ARMY

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I ask you, Mr. Davis, whether any definite program for a land army has been developed, as far as you know?

Mr. DAVIS. A good deal of work has been done right in the Extension Service, and in a number of the States; but it hasn't all been brought together yet.

LIMITATION OF INEXPERIENCED WORKERS IN CONNECTION WITH RANCHING

Senator O'MAHONEY. I am frank to say to you that out in our country ranching is a rather difficult job. I doubt whether you could find 10 very good hay hands in all of Congress—and maybe not in the executive bureaus, even. I am just wondering if we can expect to make sheepherders and cowboys out of those who are picked up in the towns, even in the Western States.

Mr. DAVIS. I wouldn't want them handling the lambing for me.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I wouldn't think you would.

Mr. DAVIS. But I think you can get a lot of help in the hayfield and the harvesting. But I wouldn't want to place too much emphasis on it.

PROGRAM FOR A LAND ARMY

Senator O'MAHONEY. Do I understand you to say the Extension Service has already laid out some plans on that?

Mr. DAVIS. We have made some plans on it. And I want to point out that there are about 2,200 counties in each of which we would want to have this emergency-labor assistant moved right in for the county agent's aid to handle the labor. Then I would say we would have to have some of what you might call assistants to work with the high schools in the United States; and we have scheduled about 1,600 of them to handle what the Extension Service has called the victory farm volunteers.

QUESTION AS TO UTILIZING FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Those things we could move on immediately. Then Senator Tydings asked about F. S. A. I don't know how many employees they have. I think we have a lot of men in there. I would say where the man is useful to the county agent, and is detailed there, he may be used as his labor assistant.

The man I have in mind—I am asking him primarily because he is an A–1 executive—has been successful in a large number of enterprises all over the United States.

(A discussion followed off the record.)

Senator O'MAHONEY. I brought the sugar problem up solely as an illustration of the necessity for getting practical workers rather than dilettante workers from the towns.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Which just wouldn't work, in my judgment.

QUESTION AS TO PLACING OF LIMITATIONS ON CARRYING OUT OF PROGRAM

Senator TYDINGS. Mr. Davis, I take it what you would like to have is the appropriation of this money, to be expended for certain purposes, namely, the recruitment of labor, and so forth, and so forth, and so forth, with practically no definitions or restrictions thrown around it, so that you might use whatever forces you find, upon examination, are available and best suited to get the labor where you want it. Is that a fair deduction?

Mr. DAVIS. I don't mean exactly that; naturally you will have some restrictions. I don't want a clean, blank check; it isn't that strong. And there may be provisions or details you will have to put in, for example, to authorize the use of the Extension Service. On these details, I would like to have somebody from the Department sit down with your drafting men and go over some of those things.

Senator TYDINGS. I probably stated it oversimplifiedly in making my statement. But it seems to me you have just come and assumed these responsibilities, and what you may say today you might want to change somewhat tomorrow.

Mr. DAVIS. Sure.

Senator TYDINGS. So I would like to suggest that as far as time will permit, at the conclusion of this committee hearing, and after you have conferred with these other people, you bring us a substitute bill with the ideas you have in it, so that we can see how nearly we can go along with you.

Mr. DAVIS. That may be all right. Frankly, I am planning to pull out of here tomorrow, to fly back to St. Louis to meet with the board of my bank, because, after all, I am more or less responsible to that institution until they release me. I will fly back here immediately afterward, and will probably be back here Saturday morning. But I haven't built up enough of an organization here to know. I can ask the Solicitor to draft a bill along the lines I have suggested.

QUESTION AS TO AMOUNT OF APPROPRIATION REQUIRED

Senator RUSSELL. Do you care to comment on the amount of this appropriation, Mr. Davis, or to make any suggestions on that phase of it?

Mr. DAVIS. Frankly, I don't know. We have worked out with the Extension Service how they would use the amount of money provided under the House bill. Whether we would be able to do more with a great deal more money effectively to increase the number of trained workers that could be brought into your territory, I don't know. I don't kow whether it is 26 or 56 or 65 million dollars we could spend. That original estimate, I know, was based on estimates prepared in the Department of Agriculture, representing the sum of money they wanted to do the job.

CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FARM LABOR CAMPS

There are some things in there that can possibly be left out of it, like building new camps. I mean we have a lot of camps around the country which we ought to make use of before building new ones.

Again, I doubt whether the Extension Service is the agency you want to take the responsibility for administering the camps. They are not, after all, an administrative organization, as Senator Holman pointed out.

Senator HAYDEN. My recollection is that out of the original estimate of $65,000,000, the break-down showed that about $55,000,000 would be expended by the Farm Security Administration.

Senator RUSSELL. I think that is approximately correct—not through the Farm Security Administration but through that agency and the Employment Service.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Senator HAYDEN. The House very definitely made up its mind it didn't want the program handled that way.

Senator TYDINGS. What I had in mind before was this: Mr. Davis has been appointed by the President to do a particular job, which is in line with the objectives of this bill, and its success or failure is going more or less to depend upon how he does that job. I would be very curious to see what bill Mr. Davis would draw as to the method he feels would be the best way he can do this job, rather than have him consider our needs in doing the job. Because if it fails, I would like to have the responsibility be on Mr. Davis rather than on the Congress.

(A discussion followed off the record.)

PROVISION IN BUDGET ESTIMATE FOR CAMPS

Mr. DAVIS. I notice, on this question of money, the item [reading]:

Construction of 250 new farm-labor camps and preparation of 300 sites and operation and maintenance of the 250 camps and 95 existing camps, $17,472,072.

There was an item of 17⅛ million dollars. It seems to me, at this stage of the game, we could well pass that up, or a part of it. Of course, that figure includes the operation of camps, which is necessary, though the number of camps to be constructed could probably be reduced.

Senator THOMAS. Don't you think you had better devote your attention to finding out where you can get the men?

Mr. DAVIS. It seems so to me—and probably there are other items in there that may be large. Naturally, they wanted money enough to do the job.

Senator BANKHEAD. I think the greater the need for men the more anxious and willing the farmers themselves will be to take care of them.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

DRAFT OF JOINT RESOLUTION REQUESTED

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Davis, I know of your burden, and that you want to get back to St. Louis. But if you could study the original

budget estimate and the House bill, and have someone prepare a draft that embraces your thought on this and submit it to the committee, we would be very glad to have it.

You haven't an organization, you have stated?

Mr. DAVIS. No.

Senator RUSSELL. Did you read over the original bill yesterday, as sent over from the House?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, I have gone over it; but I haven't talked to the people responsible for fixing the basis upon which they reached their figures.

Senator RUSSELL. How about the sufficiency of the power conferred by the original bill?

Mr. DAVIS. I think there was ample power placed right in the Secretary of Agriculture in the original bill. And if that bill had passed, then of course the President's order, I imagine, would have passed that power over onto me

There are a lot of little things that need to be put in the bill, in dealing with the authorization to use the Extension Service; and you need the assistance of technical people in putting that in. I could have the Solicitor of the Department, after talking with him, sit down with a man from the legislative counsel's office.

Senator RUSSELL. We have our legislative counsel here on this measure, Mr. Murphy, who has been working on it right along.

Mr. DAVIS. Suppose Bob Shields, after I talk with him, sits down with Mr. Murphy on this, then.

Senator TYDINGS. What I mean to say, Mr. Davis, is that I feel disposed, within any reasonable limit, as far as I individually am concerned, to try to give you the bill that you feel will permit you to do this work; and I don't want to hold back any power or procedure which you feel will be efficacious, because I feel it is a hard job and that we ought to be rather liberal, now that you have the responsibility, in giving you the power to do the job. I am just wondering if this bill is satisfactory; and, if not, can you give us a better one?

Mr. DAVIS. You have that problem, too, Senator Hayden mentioned.

Senator TYDINGS. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS. And your judgment on that would be a whole lot better than mine.

Senator TYDINGS. You weren't here when the House bill came over, and obviously this whole picture is changed since that time.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Senator TYDINGS. I think the House is interested in getting results.

Senator HOLMAN. There is certainly a determination that they don't want the Farm Security Administration in the program.

Senator TYDINGS. That is right.

Senator OVERTON. It is somewhat of a new venture, Mr. Davis, and I think you have correctly made the observation that the success of it depends on the administration of it.

Mr. DAVIS. That is right.

Senator OVERTON. And as to just what ought to be done, something may occur to you one day, and the next day it be wrong and something else ought to be done. I think if we fixed the power in you to

proceed, with the general objective we have in mind, it would probably be the best answer to the questions that have been raised here by the other members of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS. Senator Tydings' request was a very fair one, and I will get the Solicitor of the Department to whip together a draft representing the best feeling I have. As you say, it may be wrong tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. But I will do that, and will ask Mr. Shields to get in touch with you, Mr. Chairman, or Mr. Murphy.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes.

IMPORTATION OF FARM LABOR FROM MEXICO

Senator NYE. Mr. Davis, I was impressed by testimony offered here by the California congressional delegation, and by some from New Mexico and Arizona, respecting the contention that Mexican labor can be handled much more efficiently if we would, somehow, go back to the old system of permitting individual collectors of labor to go down there and pick it up and bring it in here. Do you have any thought on that score at all?

Mr. DAVIS. No, I don't, Senator. I don't know whether it would be handled better or not. Now that it has been established on the basis of treaty contract, in a sense, with the Mexican Government, it might be very slow and time-consuming to work it over on some other basis.

Senator NYE. I think it is altogether probable we are going to get mighty little of that kind of help, in the final analysis.

Mr. DAVIS. I am not sure. I think I would like to try it. I would like to try to get what we can, and arrange for its movement up to the point where an organization directed by the Extension Service could take charge—and I wouldn't want to limit it strictly to the Extension Service, because you can get a lot of help within the States; and where the county agent and the director of extension lead, as in most of these States, they will distribute it and put it to work. But I don't know, and the men I have on it will find out pretty soon about what can be done.

Senator RUSSELL. Are there any further questions of Mr. Davis?

Do you have any further comment, Mr. Davis?

RECRUITMENT OF FARM LABOR FROM INTERIOR OF MEXICO

Senator TYDINGS. I think Mr. Davis ought to be put on notice about one piece of testimony, which might otherwise escape him. There was a lot of testimony here that a great deal of Mexican labor that came in last year was recruited from a part of Mexico where they were not familiar with agriculture, and evidently they were taking a number of people so that they could come up here and learn American ways and carry that knowledge back with them. The only reason I bring it up is, if it has escaped you up until now, that you may learn about it and not run into the same difficulty when you attempt to get that labor.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you. I had heard about it from the California people.

I do not want to say this, that I hope the Senators will be reasonably patient and will let me have time to get into this thing, because

it is going to be a tough one. I have been out of this war and far away from it in the last 2 or 3 years and it takes a little time, naturally, to get in. And if I can get set up there with an organization, where I will have some freedom, then I would like to have an opportunity to discuss this business further with you, as I have before.

(A brief discussion followed off the record.)

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Senator RUSSELL. I offer for the record the following statement by Mr. Frederick Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange.

(The statement referred to follows:)

The National Grange desires to call to the attention of the Senate Committee on Appropriations the significant service being rendered by the departments of vocational agriculture of the public schools of America, under the direction of the respective State boards for vocational education.

In addition to their regular activities, which includes the training of in-school farm youth for work on farms, they have had the responsibility of organizing, conducting, and supervising rural war-production training courses which include the training of seasonal and year around farm workers as well as specific courses designed to increase the production of essential farm commodities and courses in farm machinery repair.

This program of training is serving the war effort effectively in that more than 55,000 of these courses are being operated in more than 12,000 centers.

The National Grange has always supported the vocational-education program operating through the public schools and believes that any training program should be channeled through the already organized and functioning public-school system.

We are aware of the need of cooperation among all agencies serving farm people during the present emergency. We are also intensely interested in avoiding confusion and duplication of effort and, therefore, recommend that House Joint Resolution 96, dated March 19, 1943, be amended as follows:

Amend line 3, page 1, by striking out the word "training."

Amend lines 24 and 25, page 2, by striking out the word "training."

Amend line 19, page 4, by striking out the word "training."

According to our information the vocational schools now have the necessary personnel, facilities, and money to train workers along vocational lines.

The reason why we think the word "training" should be eliminated from House Joint Resolution 96 is that it will remove all opportunity and temptation for the Extension Service to set up a duplicating system of training, which of course would cost a lot of additional money and lead to a lot of conflict and bad feeling between those engaged in vocational education and the Extension Service.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.

MARCH 31, 1943.

STATEMENT BY NATHAN COWAN, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Senator RUSSELL. I also file for the record a statement by Mr. Nathan Cowan, legislative representative of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

(The statement referred to follows:)

The Congress of Industrial Organizations is vitally interested in the enactment by Congress of legislation which will provide for an effective program of recruiting agricultural workers to meet the needs of war-food production in 1943.

84461—43——18

A first requirement for the success of such a program is provision of adequate funds to be expended through an efficiently operated, centrally controlled agency which will recruit and place agricultural workers, transport over long distances where necessary, and guarantee the conditions of employment which will make operation of the program possible.

House Joint Resolution 96 in its present form will completely defeat the establishment of an effective farm-labor program.

By its allocation of responsibility to the Extension Service and its provision that agricultural workers may not be transported from the counties or States where they reside without approval of the county agent and the State commissioner of agriculture, it will produce a freezing of workers without respect to the need for their services or to the essential nature of the work in which they are engaged. Furthermore, the Extension Services, decentralized in 3,000 counties and dominated in many cases by agricultural employers, are ill adapted to carry out a transportation program which must be based on accurate knowledge of over-all needs and a desire to meet critical shortage problems without regard for special interests in areas of labor surplus.

By its prohibition of housing, wage, or other guaranties to the workers who are to be transported by the Government, House Joint Resolution 96 will make impossible the program of efficient recruitment which will be necessary in 1943.

We therefore urge that the Senate Appropriations Committee:

(1) Eliminate from House Joint Resolution 96 the provisions placing authority for operation of the farm-labor program in the Extension Service, and requiring approval of county agents and State agricultural commissioners before workers can be transported. The provision prohibiting guaranties of housing, minimum wage, and other conditions necessary for effective recruitment of workers.

(2) Restore the amount of $65,000,000 originally provided in the resolution for operation of the farm-labor program.

(3) Provide for operation of the program by the Farm Security Administration, the agency which successfully transported 12,000 workers from areas of labor surplus to areas of shortage in 1942.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations is well aware that conditions may arise in 1943 which will call for emergency mobilizations of nonagricultural workers to get in the crops. We offer the cooperation of our affiliated organizations in making workers available where critical needs exist to the end that the program of producing adequate food for victory in 1943 may be successful.

STATEMENT BY DONALD HENDERSON, INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT, UNITED CANNERY, AGRICULTURAL PACKING AND ALLIED WORKERS OF AMERICA, CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Senator RUSSELL. I also submit for the record at this point a statement filed on behalf of the United Cannery, Agricultural Packing and Allied Workers of America, C. I. O.

(The statement referred to follows:)

In drafting legislation to appropriate funds for a farm-labor program which will meet the needs of war-food production Congress faces a problem serious in itself and greatly aggravated by misinformation, a business-as-usual approach to the problem, and the desire of special-interest groups to use a serious emergency as a means of perpetuating conditions of anarchy in the farm-labor market. Scare headlines throughout 1942 proclaimed an over-all labor shortage while the facts have proved that the real problem was one of distribution.

In peacetime with large surpluses of farm workers available it was possible to muddle through on this basis. In the middle of a war it is essential that we apply ourselves to specific problems connected with mobilizing workers for the 1943 season so that farmers may have the assurance that the Government is doing its utmost to make provisions for their needs and farm workers may have equal assurance that they will have an opportunity to make a real contribution to the war effort.

A prerequisite for the solution of the farm-labor problem is all-out conversion of agriculture to a war footing through: Elimination of nonessential production and concentration on production of essential foods; participation of the 2,000,000 underemployed small farmers who are still outside the war program; and the various provisions for adequate credit, incentive payments, and other aids and

controls which will effectively implement conversion to war production. Real conversion would release for work in essential crops 2,000,000 workers now tied down to the production of crops which will be needed to fight the war.

In the light of these general principles we propose that the specific problem of providing for the supply and distribution of farm labor be broken down into its most important aspects and treated in a businesslike manner on the basis of the issues involved. The following are the most important problems which must be tackled and met:

(1) Provision must be made for maintaining the mobility of agricultural workers who in past years have traveled under their own power, but who this year will not have the gas or rubber to do so. Without a mobile labor force corresponding to the army of migrants who in past years met seasonal demands, it will be impossible to provide for critical areas of labor shortage. Such a mobile army of workers can be obtained from known areas of labor surplus and transported to areas where shortages occur.

(2) Provision for an effective recruiting and training service to make the best utilization of regular seasonal agricultural workers who are available for employment without the necessity for transportation over long distances. Provision for emergency mobilization of women, young people, etc., to meet needs for seasonal workers where regular recruitment and placing and a Government transportation program are not sufficient.

(3) There must be a program for the recruitment and training of year-round workers.

(4) Provision of conditions under which it will be possible to recruit workers for jobs: housing, guaranteed minimum wages to be paid, etc.

ANALYSIS OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96

Our judgment of the resolution before the Senate committee is determined by the extent to which it meets the basic needs outlined above.

(1) Does this resolution provide the means by which workers can be got on the job to meet the needs of farmers in 1943?

House Joint Resolution 96 in its present form fails coimpletely to provide for a mobile agriculture labor force. Starting out as legislation to insure an adequate supply of labor, it has emerged from the House as legislation whose enactment will only intensify and create shortages by freezing agricultural workers where they are, regardless of the real needs of war production.

The resolution before the committee places responsibility for recruiting and placing agricultural workers with the State and Federal Extension Service. During the hearings conducted by the House Committee on Appropriations both the Director of the Federal Extension Service and the Secretary of Agriculture stated that the Extension Service is not equipped to do the job. This is understandable, since the Extension Services are decentralized, operating through county agents in 3,000 counties, only loosely controlled by the Federal Extension Service. It is inconceivable that such apparatus could have the facilities for knowing needs in distant areas and transporting workers to meet these needs. The resolution further requires that no workers be moved out of a county without the written consent of the county agricultural agent or out of the State without the written consent of the State commissioner of agriculture. With the best will in the world county agents and State officials will inevitably think in terms of maintaining whatever labor force is available within their own areas. When it is remembered that in many cases the Farm Bureau, an organization of agricultural employers, pays part of the county agent's salary, it is clear that such officials will tend to maintain conditions of labor surplus where they exist so as to prevent farm wages from rising.

If the decreasing numbers of agricultural workers are to be used effectively for war production, it must be possible for them to move freely from one area of peak seasonal demand to another and from areas of underutilized labor surplus to areas of critical labor shortage.

House Joint Resolution 96 as it is now written will produce complete immobilization instead of maintaining the mobility of workers.

(2) The resolution provides that no funds shall be used to set minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to "impose or enforce collective bargaining requirements or union membership."

In objecting to this provision, which is directed at the guarantees of adequate housing and minimum earnings of 30 cents an hour provided for in the Farm

Security Administration contracts, it is not necessary to discuss whether the substandard conditions under which agricultural workers are employed should or should not be changed. The plain fact is that it will be impossible to recruit workers for employment in agriculture if they have no assurance whatsoever as to the conditions under which they will be employed. The case of industrial war plants where production has been disrupted and held up because of lack of housing applies equally in agriculture. We are not stating theories; we are pointing to simple well-known facts when we state that it is impossible to solve the agriculture labor-supply problem just as it is impossible to solve the industrial labor-supply problem without making provision for adequate housing. Similarly, in the case of wages, it is impossible to expect that American workers wtih families to support, no matter how great their patriotism, can be recruited to work in agriculture and to travel long distances for jobs while there continue to be areas such as some parts of Florida where the prevailing rate of pay is under 30 cents an hour.

Furthermore, it seems clear that foreign governments will not be likely to make workers available for employment in the United States with no guarantee as to the conditions under which they will be employed. If this is true, this resolution would actually prevent the bringing in of workers from Mexico. During the past year Mexican agricultural workers have made a great contribution to agricultural production in California and in the Southwest. That there will be further requests for such workers from the farmers in these areas no one has questioned.

ANALYSIS OF LABOR NEEDS

The figure of 3,500,000 brand new agricultural workers needed for the year of 1943 has been flung around loosely in public announcements and in statements before the House Appropriations Committee. How ridiculous this statement is can be seen from the fact that 3,500,000 wage workers is the number employed at the annual peak of agriculture production. On March 1 there were 1,727,000 hired workers employed on farms. Between now and the peak point in October some million and half more will be needed. This fact should not confuse us so that we assume none of this additional number will be available except through emergency mobilizations of nonagricultural workers. One year ago on March 1, 1942, there were 1,798,000 hired laborers employed in the United States. This number built up through normal return of workers during the seasonal up-swing, through recruitment by the United States Employment Service, which made 3,000,000 placements in 1942, and through the farm labor transportation program, to 3,234,000 in September 1942. This year the problem is more severe. Greater efforts will be required to meet it. However, nothing is to be gained by obscuring the facts and by raising the fear of a labor shortage equal to the total hired-labor population.

The farm labor-shortage problem in 1942 was primarily a problem of distribution, not a problem of over-all shortage. This is proved by the fact that at the peak of the season in 1942, when the greatest shortage could have been expected, there were 11,656,000 persons employed in agriculture as compared with 11,704,000 in 1941—a decrease of only 48,000. The facts on farm production speak as loudly as the figures on farm employment. In 1942, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the largest crops in history were harvested without serious losses due to shortages of agricultural labor.

In 1943 it is estimated that about 2,500,000 workers will be needed for 3,000,000 jobs to meet peak seasonal demand. About a million and a half, as stated above, are now employed as hired workers in agriculture. Under operation of the Tydings amendment the great bulk of these workers who are engaged in essential production will be deferred. Workers will continue to return to agricultural employment as they do every year with the normal rise in employment as the agricultural season progresses. It is certainly to be expected that an effective farm-placement service could recruit between 600,000 and 800,000 additional regular agricultural workers. If, added to this, there is a transportation program which will secure workers for several hundred thousand jobs, it will be possible to meet critical needs in shortage areas as the demand arises. It should be understood that under a Government transportation program the same workers can be transported from job to job, thus covering two or three times as many jobs as there are workers to be transported.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The serious situation which faces agriculture in 1943 can be met, but it can be met only by serious tackling of the basic problems and not by scare headlines which confuse farmers, result in decreased production and in paralysis of Government program.

We recommend:

(1) That a mobile corps of workers to meet critical needs be assured. To accomplish this, authority for operating the agricultural workers transportation program should be taken from the Extension Service and returned to the Farm Security Administration, the Agency which has had experience in operating such a program and which in 1942 transported a total of 12,000 workers.

It is essential, if a mobile corps of workers is to be recruited, that the provision requiring consent of the county agent or State agricultural commissioner before workers can be transported be stricken from the resolution.

(2) We recommend that a placement service with centralized authority be given the job of performing the routine functions of recruitment and placement which can provide a great bulk of the workers needed in an orderly fashion. Such a placement service should also have the function of mobilizing volunteers where they are necessary. Groups of union members as well as civic organizations, etc., are offering their services on week-ends and during vacation periods to do farm work where they are needed. It is essential that there be a regular and effective means of placing such volunteers where there is actual need rather than a wholesale turning loose of workers inexperienced in farm operations to confuse and disrupt production in areas where they are not needed.

(3) To make possible recruitment of workers we urge that the provision in this resolution prohibiting housing and other guaranty to the workers who are to be transported be eliminated.

(4) That the amount of $65,000,000 originally called for in House Joint Resolution 96 be restored to permit effective operation of a farm-labor program.

Senator RUSSELL. If there is nothing further, this will conclude the hearing.

(Whereupon, at 4:20 p. m., Tuesday, March 23, 1943, the hearings on House Joint Resolution 96 were concluded.)

INDEX

A

D

E

F

K

L

Mc

M

N

O

P

R

S

○

[COMMITTEE PRINT NO. 2]

April 2, 1943

78th CONGRESS
1st Session

H. J. RES. 96

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

April 5, 1943

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

---

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, viz: Strike out all after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

1 That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money
2 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of
3 $40,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943,
4 to be expended under the direction and supervision of the
5 Administrator of Food Production and Distribution (here-
6 inafter referred to as the "Administrator"), appointed pur-

1 suant to Executive Order Numbered 9322, dated March 26,
2 1943, for assisting in providing an adequate supply of
3 workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural
4 commodities essential to the prosecution of the war.

5 PAYMENTS TO STATES

6 SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of assisting in providing an
7 adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting
8 of agricultural commodities within the several States, the
9 Administrator may apportion among the several States, on
10 the basis of need, not more than $20,000,000 of the sum ap-
11 propriated by section 1 and the sums so apportioned shall be
12 available for payment to such States for expenditure by the
13 agricultural extension services in such States, in accordance
14 with rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator
15 and in accordance with such agreements as may be entered
16 into by the Administrator and such extension services. The
17 purposes for which such funds may be expended by such ex-
18 tension services shall include, among other things, (1) the
19 recruiting, placement, and training of such workers; (2)
20 transportation, supervision, subsistence, protection, health
21 and medical and burial services, and shelter for such workers
22 and their families and necessary personal property; (3) con-
23 struction or lease and operation of labor supply centers and
24 other necessary facilities and services; (4) advancing to
25 workers of sums due from employers; (5) employment of

1 personnel and other administrative expenses; and (6) pay-
2 ment to or reimbursement of other public or private agencies
3 or individuals for furnishing services or facilities for such
4 purposes. Such extension services may enter into agree-
5 ments with other public and private agencies and individuals
6 and utilize the facilities and services of such agencies and
7 individuals in carrying out the purposes of this section.

8 (b) The Administrator shall certify to the Secretary of
9 the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts to be paid to
10 each State under this section and the time or times such
11 amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury
12 shall pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the
13 Administrator, the amounts so certified.

14 EXPENDITURE OF OTHER FUNDS

15 SEC. 3. (a) The funds appropriated by section 1 and
16 not apportioned by the Administrator among the several
17 States pursuant to section 2 shall be available for expendi-
18 ture by the Administrator. The purposes for which such
19 funds may be expended shall include, among other things,
20 (1) the recruiting, placement, and transportation of workers
21 and their families and necessary personal property, within
22 the United States and elsewhere; (2) furnishing, by loans,
23 grants, or otherwise, of health and medical and burial serv-
24 ices, training, subsistence, allowances, protection, and shelter
25 for such workers and their families; (3) advancing to workers

1 of sums due from employers; (4) construction or lease and
2 operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facili-
3 ties and services; and (5) operating personnel and expenses
4 to carry out the above purposes. Sums collected by way of
5 reimbursement for advances made under the authority of
6 this subsection shall be deposited to this appropriation, or
7 to appropriations for similar purposes available when reim-
8 bursement is received, and such deposits shall be available
9 for the purposes of the appropriation.

10 (b) Not more than 5 per centum of the funds appro-
11 priated by section 1 hereof shall be available for adminis-
12 trative expenses of the Administrator, including (1) the em-
13 ployment of persons and organizations, by contract or other-
14 wise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (2) purchase,
15 exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying
16 vehicles; (3) printing and binding; (4) travel expenses of
17 persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facili-
18 tating capacities within a foreign country or from a foreign
19 country to the United States and return, including such
20 expenses to first-duty stations; and (5) payment to or reim-
21 bursement of other agencies or individuals for administrative
22 expenses incurred by them.

23 (c) For the purpose of this joint resolution, the Ad-
24 ministrator is authorized—

25 (1) to utilize the facilities, services, and personnel

of units and agencies within the Department of Agriculture; to enter into agreements with other public or private agencies or individuals; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals and to delegate to them functions under this joint resolution; and to allocate or transfer funds to (in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944), or otherwise to pay or reimburse such units, agencies, and individuals for expenses in connection therewith;

(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

(3) to cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign governments relating to the importation of workers into the United States.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 4. (a) Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be expended without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) Any payments made by the United States or other public or private agencies or employers to aliens brought into the United States under this joint resolution shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b)

1 of the Internal Revenue Code. Aliens brought into the
2 United States under this joint resolution shall be exempt
3 from the payment of the head tax required by section 2
4 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other
5 admission charges.

6 (c) For the purpose of this joint resolution—

7 (1) the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and
8 Puerto Rico;

9 (2) the term "worker" includes nationals of the
10 United States and aliens, and, without limitation thereof,
11 tenants and sharecroppers.

12 (d) The former Civilian Conservation Corps camps
13 shall be transferred without charge to the Administrator, to
14 the extent that he deems necessary to carry out the purposes
15 of this joint resolution.

April 2, 1943

78th CONGRESS
1st Session

H. J. RES. 96

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. _____ to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

April , 1943

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

Upset

"Whereas the tremendous productive facilities of Chicago, which include the war plants proper, the immediate availability of water and electrical supplies and power, its nearness to vital war materials and natural resources, and its preeminent position as the hub of the greatest railroad, air, and water network of transportation facilities in the world make it imperative that no action be taken which would impair even slightly the magnitude of its contributions; and

"Whereas in addition to the above factors, authoritative statistics disclose that there is no acute labor shortage and a less degree of labor absenteeism in the Chicago war zone than in any other part of the Nation; and

"Whereas the factors which induced the War Manpower Commission to make its ruling should be reconsidered immediately in order to prevent needless and dangerous impairment of the war effort: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That we respectfully urge Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, to reconsider immediately the order of said Commission banning the allocation of additional war contracts to Chicago and adjacent area for the reasons enumerated in the preamble hereto; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded to Hon. Paul V. McNutt and to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois, to the end that those of the same view may collaborate in their efforts to effectuate the purpose of this resolution."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOLMAN, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 212. A bill to provide for punishment of persons who escape or attempt to escape from the custody of officers or employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 155).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 2076. A bill to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 156).

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. McKELLAR), from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943; with an amendment (Rept. No. 157).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 961. A bill for the relief of C. A. Ragland, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 962. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holel an, the Buffalo Insurance Co., and the Miller Insurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. ANDREWS):

S. 963. A bill relating to the imposition of certain penalties and the payment of detention expenses incident to the bringing of certain aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 694. A bill to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 965. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ella W. Hoback; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 966. A bill to provide for the payment in advance of pay and travel allowances to persons in or serving with the military and naval service and to civilian officers and employees in or under the jurisdiction of the War Department or the Navy Department under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DANAHER:

S. 967. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 968. A bill for the relief of the Norfolk Plumbing & Heating Co., and others; to the Committee on Claims.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 328. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 837. An act to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1397. An act to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 905. An act to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in certain land constituting a portion of the tract of land conditionally granted to the county of Los Angeles, State of California, under the act of March 24, 1933, as amended; and

H. R. 1857. An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1037. An act preserving the nationality of a person born in Puerto Rico who resides for 5 years in a foreign state;

H. R. 1284. An act relating to the naturalization of persons not citizens who serve honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war; and

H. R. 1680. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 1201. An act to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration;

H. R. 1202. An act to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code; and

H. R. 2087. An act to provide for the punishment of certain hostile acts against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1860. An act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes; to the calendar.

H. R. 2281. An act to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of the services of merchant sailors; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 2292. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war";

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee; and

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BONDING FEDERAL OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 26) to provide for the bonding of Federal officials and employees, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. GUFFEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 128), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Mines and Mining, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

AMERICAN - RUSSIAN - BRITISH FRIENDSHIP—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. CHANDLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah at a mass meeting dedicated to the consolidation of American-Russian-British friendship, held at Carnegie Hall, New York City, April 4, 1943, under the auspices of the Committee of Jewish Writers and Artists, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE OBLIGATION OF EVERY AMERICAN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Obligation of Every American," delivered by him at the annual meeting of the Rock County Bar Association at Janesville, Wis., March 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARMY DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY HON. JESSE H. JONES

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, at the Army Day dinner of the Military Order of the World War, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, on April 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

USE OF ELECTRICITY ON THE FARM—ADDRESS BY VINCENT D. NICHOLSON

[Mr. VAN NUYS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address relating to use of electricity on the farm, delivered by Vincent D. Nicholson, before the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at St. Louis, Mo., January 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

REHABILITATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., relative to the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped, and also a copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 43, introduced by him on March 16, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

CHURCHES CAN END WAR—LETTER BY TOM BURNS

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Tom Burns, of Portland, Oreg., and printed in the Portland Oregonian of April 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED NATIONAL WAR SERVICE ACT—ARTICLE FROM THE WITNESS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Witness of March 25, 1943, on the subject of a proposed National War Service Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED NATIONAL WAR SERVICE ACT—EDITORIAL FROM THE WITNESS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Witness of March 25, 1943, on the subject of a proposed National War Service Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION OF RUBBER—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the production of rubber entitled "How About a Recount?" written by Frank C. Waldrop and published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MANPOWER QUESTION—ARTICLE BY ROBERT L. NORTON

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "All Must Join in To Win War" written by Robert L. Norton and published in the Boston Sunday Post of April 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLICIES FOR THE POST-WAR PERIOD—ARTICLE BY MAJ. GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to policies for the post-war period, by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

BLOW TO ISOLATIONISM—EDITORIAL FROM THE LORAIN (OHIO) JOURNAL

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Blow to Isolationism," published on March 17, 1943, in the Lorain (Ohio) Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

WOMAN'S HOME COMPANION OPINION POLL—AFTER WAR—PEACE?

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of an opinion poll taken by the Woman's Home Companion in April 1943 on the question After War—Peace?, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM LABOR AND FOOD PRODUCTION—ARTICLE FROM THE MILLER (S. DAK.) GAZETTE

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Farmers Out in Fields for First Time on Thursday," from the Miller (S. Dak.) Gazette of March 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREVENTION OF DEDUCTIONS IN DETERMINING PARITY OR COMPARABLE PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—VETO

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into last Friday, automatically the veto message of the President comes up for consideration, and I understand it is now before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understands, the agreement was merely informal.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it was only an informal agreement, I should like to have it made formal by asking unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the veto message and the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the Chair lays before the Senate the message from the President of the United States withholding his approval from Senate bill 660.

(For veto message, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1942, pp. 2876 et seq.)

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 660) to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

INSTRUCTION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, for many years I have been fearful that our schools were failing to teach the youth of the country the true significance of the events which lie behind our Nation's history. I have gained this information from talking to youths of 15 and to middle-aged citizen who are utterly ignorant of the great political events without which no one can understand our national heritage. These persons have shown little knowledge and even little interest concerning the founders and builders of our country, whose aims and ideals we are now attempting to safeguard forever.

It is a well-known fact that State legislatures have been interested in deleting chapters and statements from history books at the insistence of certain powerful groups which are unwilling to have the public know the truth.

A further cause for ignorance lies in the fact that for the past decade or more the enthusiasts of the so-called social science studies have convinced many of our educators that these subjects should be taught in place of history, insisting that social trends rather than real historial events were sufficient for understanding our Nation's history. A few years ago I happened to see a book on civics and social studies which was being widely used in my own city of Pittsburgh, and I was amazed to find the account of a famous society murder trial taking up much space.

What this had to do with training youth along lines of proper conduct I have never been able to comprehend. But it proved that high-school students were being taught such sordid facts rather than the glowing events of our own local history.

We are greatly indebted to the New York Times for the service it has rendered by exposing the lack of proper teaching of history in our schools. At the same time, all of us must feel a deep sense of humiliation to realize that our students are being not only improperly taught, but that this teaching must be due to the exceedingly poor textbooks.

I know that we, as members of the National Legislature, cannot legislate wisely for a people which is being kept ignorant of its own history, in order to close our eyes to facts which might prove inconvenient to the great vested interests, including, of course, the great political interests.

How can we deal with farm legislation if we do not link present emergencies with a long chain of facts stretching back through the First World War, to populism and free silver, to free land and slavery, back to debt and taxes, including facts relative to Shay's rebellion, and beyond?

I might even include in that story a reference to the so-called Whisky Rebellion in my own State, except that I doubt that there are many people, outside a handful of students of history, who understand that the Whisky Rebellion was an armed uprising of Pennsylvania farmers against high and discriminatory taxes. How many of us really know why France helped the American Revolution against England?

How many of us know the part played by the Masonic order in the formation of the Republic.

How many of us know why Thomas Jefferson led the American revolt against Hamilton and the Federalists?

How many of us know the real story of how Nicholas Biddle and the Bank of the United States bought up Members of Congress in the battle when Jackson led the forces for financial freedom?

How many of us know the reason why Abraham Lincoln was attacked so bitterly by his own party, and was only saved from the impeachment which was brought against his Vice President by the fact that he was assassinated?

How many of us know how business stole the country blind in the 1870's, and how or why a Presidential election was stolen in 1876?

We are fighting a war to preserve the freedoms of which the men in the front lines are ignorant. The Army has already taken steps to instruct the soldiers regarding the real meaning of this war. I trust every other branch of the armed forces is doing the same. But again I say, this cannot be properly done without accurate textbooks. This is now a challenge to the educators and textbook writers of this country.

Calendar No. 158

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 96

[Report No. 157]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 19 (legislative day, MARCH 9), 1943

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

APRIL 6, 1943

Reported by Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. MCKELLAR), with an amendment

[Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic]

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 ~~That for expenses necessary for the recruiting, training, and~~
4 ~~placement of workers needed for the production and harvest-~~
5 ~~ing of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution~~
6 ~~of the war (including agricultural workers who are imported~~
7 ~~into the United States from foreign countries and aliens in-~~
8 ~~terned in the United States); to be expended under the~~
9 ~~supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension~~
10 ~~Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in~~
11 ~~cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the~~

~~land-grant colleges in the respective States on the basis of existing cooperative agreements between the Department and the land-grant colleges as to the conduct of extension work and apportioned to the States on the basis of need for the purposes specified herein; for transportation and subsistence of workers and expenditures for construction, rental, or operation of temporary suitable housing or shelter facilities for such workers where existing housing facilities are not adequate (including for the purposes specified herein, agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States), to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Agricultural Extension Service in cooperation with the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States, as hereinbefore specified, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $26,100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943, of which not less than $100,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of Extension, and not less than $13,500,000 shall be apportioned to the extension services in the States on the basis of need to enable them to carry out their responsibilities hereunder within the States, including the recruiting, training, and placement of farm labor, the provision, operation,~~

~~and supervision of temporary housing and shelter facilities and the transportation, supervision, temporary subsistence, and protection of workers within the States as herein provided; the remaining funds not to exceed $12,500,000 to be available as provided herein to carry out cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service for recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to State, and imported workers, including the payment of necessary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and protection of such workers while en route, and including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for the importation of workers from Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this Act, but not to exceed a period of thirty days after the enactment of this Act: *Provided,* That the Office of Extension Service in the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the State extension services in the States which are concerned in obtaining such labor are authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such domestic~~

1 ~~and imported labor to and from the respective States and~~
2 ~~the extension services in the States either individually or~~
3 ~~collectively may enter into such agreements with the United~~
4 ~~States Employment Service to recruit and transport such~~
5 ~~labor, subject to general rules and regulations to be issued~~
6 ~~by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the~~
7 ~~United States Employment Services: *Provided further,*~~
8 ~~That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be ex-~~
9 ~~pended for the transportation of any worker from the~~
10 ~~county where he resides or is working to a place of employ-~~
11 ~~ment outside of such county without the prior consent in~~
12 ~~writing of the county extension agent of such county, or for~~
13 ~~the transportation of any worker outside the limits of the~~
14 ~~State where he resides or is working without the prior con-~~
15 ~~sent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture for such~~
16 ~~State or other official who performs similar functions for such~~
17 ~~State: *Provided further,* That the extension services of the~~
18 ~~land-grant colleges shall be responsible for the recruiting,~~
19 ~~training, transportation, and placement of all such workers~~
20 ~~within their respective States; and the Extension Service is~~
21 ~~authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated~~
22 ~~services and to cooperate with any other public or private~~
23 ~~agency: *Provided further,* That existing farm labor camps~~
24 ~~and other necessary housing or shelter facilities now owned or~~
25 ~~hereafter acquired by the United States Department of Agri-~~

1 ~~culture and former Civilian Conservation Corps camps where~~
2 ~~suitably located shall be made available to such workers to the~~
3 ~~extent they are required and shall be operated under the~~
4 ~~supervision of the Extension Service as hereinbefore pro-~~
5 ~~vided so long as such facilities are required for this purpose:~~
6 ~~*Provided further,* That expenditures may be made here-~~
7 ~~under without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes:~~
8 ~~*Provided further,* That any payments made by the United~~
9 ~~States or private employers to aliens brought in under this~~
10 ~~program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding~~
11 ~~under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code:~~
12 ~~*Provided further,* That no part of the funds herein appro-~~
13 ~~priated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made~~
14 ~~available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment,~~
15 ~~transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used~~
16 ~~directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum~~
17 ~~wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or~~
18 ~~to impose or enforce collective bargaining requirements or~~
19 ~~union membership with respect to any agricultural labor~~
20 ~~exempted under the provisions of section 3 (f), 7 (c), and~~
21 ~~13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938,~~
22 ~~or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of~~
23 ~~the National Labor Relations Act: *Provided further,* That~~
24 ~~the terms "States" or "State" as used herein include Puerto~~
25 ~~Rico and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.~~

1 *That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money*
2 *in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of*
3 *$40,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943,*
4 *to be expended under the direction and supervision of the*
5 *Administrator of Food Production and Distribution (here-*
6 *inafter referred to as the "Administrator"), appointed pur-*
7 *suant to Executive Order Numbered 9322, dated March 26,*
8 *1943, for assisting in providing an adequate supply of*
9 *workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural*
10 *commodities essential to the prosecution of the war.*

11 PAYMENTS TO STATES

12 *SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of assisting in providing an*
13 *adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting*
14 *of agricultural commodities within the several States, the*
15 *Administrator shall apportion among the several States, on*
16 *the basis of need, not less than $13,500,000 and not more*
17 *than $20,000000 of the sum appropriated by section 1 and*
18 *the sums so apportioned shall be available for payment to*
19 *such States for expenditure by the agricultural extension*
20 *services in such States, the administration of which*
21 *funds shall be subject to the supervision and approval of*
22 *the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may*
23 *be expended by such extension services shall include, among*
24 *other things, (1) the recruiting, placement (including the*

1 *placement of workers as tenants or sharecroppers), and*
2 *training of such workers; (2) transportation, supervision,*
3 *subsistence, protection, health and medical and burial services,*
4 *and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary*
5 *personal property; (3) lease, repair, alteration, and opera-*
6 *tion of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and*
7 *services, including former Civilian Conservation Corps*
8 *camps; (4) advancing to workers of sums due from em-*
9 *ployers within the United States who are under contractual*
10 *obligation to reimburse such extension services for such ad-*
11 *vances; (5) employment of personnel and other adminis-*
12 *trative expenses; and (6) payment to or reimbursement of*
13 *other public or private agencies or individuals for furnishing*
14 *services or facilities for such purposes. Such extension*
15 *services may enter into agreements with other public and*
16 *private agencies and individuals and utilize the facilities and*
17 *services of such agencies and individuals in carrying out*
18 *the purposes of this section.*

19 *(b) The Administrator shall certify to the Secretary of*
20 *the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts to be paid to*
21 *each State under this section and the time or times such*
22 *amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury*
23 *shall pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the*
24 *Administrator, the amounts so certified.*

1 *EXPENDITURE OF OTHER FUNDS*

2 *Sec. 3. (a) Not more than $20,000,000 of the funds*
3 *appropriated by section 1 and not apportioned by the Ad-*
4 *ministrator among the several States pursuant to section 2*
5 *shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator. The*
6 *purposes for which such funds may be expended shall include,*
7 *among other things, (1) the recruiting, placement (including*
8 *the placement of workers as tenants or sharecroppers), and*
9 *transportation of workers and their families and necessary*
10 *personal property, within the United States and elsewhere;*
11 *(2) furnishing, by loans, grants, or otherwise, of health and*
12 *medical and burial services, training, subsistence, allowances,*
13 *protection, and shelter for such workers and their families;*
14 *(3) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within*
15 *the United States who are under contractual obligation to*
16 *reimburse the United States for such advances; (4) lease,*
17 *repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and*
18 *other necessary facilities and services; and (5) operating*
19 *personnel and expenses to carry out the above purposes.*
20 *Sums collected by way of reimbursement for advances made*
21 *under the authority of this subsection shall be deposited to this*
22 *appropriation, or to appropriations for similar purposes*
23 *available when reimbursement is received, and such deposits*
24 *shall be available for the purposes of the appropriation.*

25 *(b) Not more than 2 per centum of the funds appro-*

1 *priated by section 1 hereof shall be available for adminis-*
2 *trative expenses of the Administrator, including (1) the em-*
3 *ployment of persons and organizations, by contract or other-*
4 *wise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (2) purchase,*
5 *exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying*
6 *vehicles; (3) printing and binding; (4) travel expenses of*
7 *persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facili-*
8 *tating capacities within a foreign country or from a foreign*
9 *country to the United States and return, including such*
10 *expenses to first-duty stations; and (5) payment to or reim-*
11 *bursement of other agencies or individuals for administrative*
12 *expenses incurred by them.*

13 *(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution, the Ad-*
14 *ministrator is authorized—*

15 *(1) to utilize the facilities, services, and personnel*
16 *of units and agencies within the Department of Agricul-*
17 *ture; to enter into agreements with other public or pri-*
18 *vate agencies or individuals; to utilize (pursuant to such*
19 *agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies*
20 *and individuals and to delegate to them functions under*
21 *this joint resolution; and to allocate or transfer funds to*
22 *(in addition to the transfers authorized by the Depart-*
23 *ment of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal*
24 *years 1943 and 1944), or otherwise to pay or reimburse*

such units, agencies, and individuals for expenses in connection therewith;

(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

(3) to cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign governments relating to the importation of workers into the United States.

LIMITATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, if such worker has resided in such county for a period of one year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period: Provided, That upon the refusal of the county extension agent to give his consent in any such case, any interested or affected person may appeal to the Administrator, and the Administrator may permit the expenditure of such funds for the transportation of such worker from such county if the Administrator finds that the services of such worker can be more effectively utilized at another place of employment.

(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or here-

tofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country: Provided, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be expended without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) Any payments made by the United States or other public or private agencies or employers to aliens brought into the United States under this joint resolution shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. Aliens brought into the

1 *United States under this joint resolution shall be exempt*
2 *from the payment of the head tax required by section 2*
3 *of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other*
4 *admission charges.*

5 *(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution—*

6 *(1) the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and*
7 *Puerto Rico;*

8 *(2) the term "worker" includes nationals of the*
9 *United States and aliens;*

10 *(3) the term "agricultural labor" includes any*
11 *services or activities included within the provisions of*
12 *section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938*
13 *or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code.*

14 *(d) Effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3*
15 *of the Act of June 29, 1936 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 433),*
16 *receipts derived for the account of the United States from*
17 *the use and occupancy of agricultural labor supply centers,*
18 *including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under*
19 *the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be*
20 *deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.*

21 *(e) The former Civilian Conservation Corps camps*
22 *shall be transferred without charge to the Administrator, to*
23 *the extent that he deems necessary to carry out the purposes*
24 *of this joint resolution: Provided, That no such camp which*
25 *is being utilized by any other agency of the Government, or*

which has been transferred to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization, shall be transferred to the Administrator under this subsection without the consent of such agency, State, county, municipality, or organization.

(f) For the purposes of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and appropriations heretofore or hereafter made to carry out the purposes of such title, no person shall be deemed not to be a needy individual by reason of remuneration paid to such person for any agricultural labor performed by him during the period beginning with the date of enactment of this joint resolution and ending six months after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President. The Federal Security Administrator shall promptly notify each State that grants under such title will be available for the payment of old-age assistance with respect to any person without regard to the remuneration received by such person for agricultural labor performed by him during such period; and no State shall be required, in determining need in the case of any individual, to take into consideration any income or resources derived by him from such agricultural labor.

Passed the House of Representatives March 17, 1943.

Attest: SOUTH TRIMBLE,

Clerk.

Calendar No. 158

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 96

[Report No. 157]

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

MARCH 19 (legislative day, MARCH 9), 1943
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

APRIL 6, 1943
Reported with an amendment

Calendar No. 158

78th Congress, 1st Session | SENATE | Report No. 157

APPROPRIATION TO ASSIST IN PROVIDING A SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR, CALENDAR YEAR 1943

April 6, 1943.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. Russell (for Mr. McKellar), from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. J. Res. 96]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, report the same to the Senate with an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the House text.

Purposes of the Appropriation

This joint resolution makes an appropriation to assist in providing a supply of agricultural workers for the production and harvesting of essential agricultural commodities. The need for such workers is so well known and so universally conceded that no lengthy exposition here is required to establish it. The loss of workers from the farms, both to the military services and to higher-paying work in industry, has brought about a critical shortage of manpower in agriculture. At the same time, the demands for agricultural production are greater than they have ever been before.

The hearings on this joint resolution indicate that farmers are making every effort to reach the production goals set for them. They are trying to plow and seed a larger acreage than ever before. Testimony was presented to the effect that in many cases their tractors are plowing day and night. While there is evidence indicating that the acreage devoted to some crops may be considerably below normal, it does seem possible that by extraordinary hard work and with considerable good fortune the farmers of the Nation may, in the case

of most crops, plant and cultivate this larger acreage. But they cannot harvest it. One of the principal purposes of this joint resolution is to provide a program by which nonfarm workers may be utilized in the harvesting of these crops. It is imperative that such a program be formulated and carried out on an effective basis, and a substantial organization will be required to direct and administer such a program.

Migratory farm workers are always an important factor in the harvesting of agricultural commodities, and ordinarily follow the harvest season from one locality to another as the season advances. This year, their number is smaller because many of them have gone into military service or industry. Those who remain are not able to move about so easily as in other years because of a lack of means for transportation. The need for their services is greater than ever before. Another of the purposes of this joint resolution is to assist in the transportation and distribution of these workers so that their services may be most effectively utilized.

While the most critical need for agricultural workers is, perhaps, in connection with the harvesting of crops, there is also a great need for year-round agricultural workers. This need is especially acute in dairy farming and in certain crops where a shortage in planted acreage is in prospect, largely because of a scarcity of labor. The program contemplated by this joint resolution would also seek to secure workers of this type and place them where they are most needed.

Administration of Program

The joint resolution, as reported by the committee, provides that the appropriation shall be expended under the direction and supervision of the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution. This is the office to which Mr. Chester C. Davis has recently been appointed by the President. Under the Executive order establishing this office, the Administrator is made responsible for agricultural production and has direction and supervision over the various units of the Department of Agriculture operating in this field, including the Extension Service. The joint resolution authorizes the Administrator to utilize the services and facilities of units and agencies within the Department of Agriculture, and of other agencies and individuals, in carrying out the agricultural labor supply program. It is contemplated that he will assign functions under the program to the various units and agencies which are best equipped to perform them.

It is the view of the committee that a large part of the program can be more effectively administered by the agricultural extension services in the several States than by any other agency. While it is impossible to draw a precise line dividing the functions which should be performed by such services from the functions which can best be performed by other agencies, the extension services should be largely responsible for the local recruiting and transportation of farm workers, and for the placement and supervision of farm workers whether recruited locally or brought in from outside the State. In order to make sure that the extension services will be utilized in the program, the resolution provides that not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000 of the appropriation shall be available for expenditure only if expended through such services.

On the other hand, there is a large part of the program, such as the recruiting of labor in foreign countries and the interstate transportation of workers, which the extension services are not equipped to administer. These are definitely Federal functions and can be effectively carried out only by Federal agencies. The committee believes that the joint resolution, as reported, represents the best possible approach to the problem in that it provides enough flexibility to make the program workable, provides for proper supervision, and also insures the use of State, local, and Federal agencies, respectively, for the administration of those parts of the program which each is best equipped to handle.

Amount of Appropriation

The original Budget estimate for this program was $65,075,000. The amount provided in the resolution as it passed the House was $26,100,000. The amount recommended by the committee is $40,000,000. As stated above, not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000 would be apportioned among the State extension services. The remaining $20,000,000 would be available for expenditure by the Administrator.

Explanation by Sections

APPROPRIATION

The first section of the joint resolution, as reported by the committee, appropriates the sum of $40,000,000 to be used for carrying out the program for assisting in providing agricultural workers for the production and harvesting of essential crops. The appropriation is to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution, and is to remain available until December 31, 1943.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

Section 2 provides that, of the money appropriated by the joint resolution, not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000 shall be apportioned by the Administrator among the several States, on the basis of need, and shall be available for payment to such States for expenditure by the agricultural extension services in such States to aid in carrying out the agricultural labor supply program. These payments will be in the nature of grants to the States and no matching of funds by the States is required. Since the extension services in the States are State organizations, this seems to be the only practicable method by which their services may be utilized in carrying out this program. In order to assure that the money paid to the States will be expended for proper purposes and in a manner consistent with the operation of the entire program, it is provided that the expenditure of such money shall be subject to the supervision and approval of the Administrator. This section specifies some of the purposes for which the money may be expended by the extension services, and provides that the extension services may enter into agreements with other agencies and individuals for the use of their services and facilities.

EXPENDITURE OF OTHER FUNDS

Section 3 provides that not more than $20,000,000 of the funds appropriated by the joint resolution and not apportioned among the State extension services shall be available to the Administrator for carrying out those parts of the program which are to be administered at the Federal level. The section specifies some of the purposes for which these funds may be spent and places a limit on the portion which may be spent for administrative purposes. This limit would apply to all administrative expenses of any unit of the Federal Government, including the Federal Extension Service, paid from these funds; but it would not, of course, apply to administrative expenses of the State extension services paid from money made available to them under section 2. This section also contains provisions authorizing the Administrator (1) to utilize the services and facilities of units and agencies within the Department of Agriculture and other agencies and individuals, (2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services, and (3) to cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation and renegotiation of agreements with foreign governments relating to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States.

LIMITATIONS

Section 4 contains, in a modified form, two provisions which were in the joint resolution as it passed the House.

The first of these provides that no part of the funds appropriated by the joint resolution shall be used for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county. As modified by the committee, this provision would apply only if the worker has resided in the county for 1 year or more and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such time, and, in the case of those workers, an appeal could be taken to the Administrator, who could then permit the expenditure of funds for their transportation if he found that their services could be more effectively utilized at some other place.

The second of these provides that no part of the funds appropriated by this joint resolution, or heretofore made available for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor. This provision has been modified by the committee so that it will permit compliance with agreements with foreign countries relating to agricultural workers brought into the United States from such countries, and so as to permit the agencies carrying out the program to negotiate with farmers agreements providing that such farmers will pay the prevailing wage to workers secured for them under the program and will provide necessary shelter for them. It is the view of the committee that it is essential to permit the negotiation of such agreements in order that workers may have some assurance as to what earnings and living conditions they may expect before they are transported long distances to new places of employment. While the committee does not feel that this program

should be used as a vehicle for establishing standards of working conditions and pay in agriculture or promoting other social reforms, the committee does feel that it is necessary to be able to require the employer, as a condition upon obtaining workers for him under this program, to enter into an agreement stating what the pay and working conditions will be so that the workers will know what to expect in those matters

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 5 (a) provides that funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be expended without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (relating to competitive bidding).

Section 5 (b) provides that payments made to aliens brought into the United States under this joint resolution shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to withholding a part of certain payments due to aliens in order to insure payment of taxes due from them). This subsection also exempts aliens brought into the United States under this joint resolution from the payment of the head tax and other admission charges ordinarily required of aliens.

Section 5 (c) contains definitions of the terms "State," "worker," and "agricultural labor."

Section 5 (d) provides that receipts derived for the account of the United States from the use and occupancy of agricultural labor supply centers shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Section 5 (e) provides that available former Civilian Conservation Corps camps shall be transferred without charge to the Administrator, to the extent that he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution. It is contemplated that these camps, where suitably located, may be used to house agricultural workers.

Section 5 (f) provides that compensation earned for agricultural labor shall not be taken into consideration in determining the need of individuals for old-age assistance under title 1 of the Social Security Act. That title now provides for grants-in-aid to the States for old-age assistance, and provides that such grants will be made only with respect to assistance for needy individuals. The purpose of this subsection is to permit recipients of old-age assistance to work as agricultural workers during the war, and for 6 months thereafter, without having such assistance discontinued or reduced.

○

Apari

President which resulted in the introduction of the bill required all agencies of the Government to deduct parity payments and soil conservation payments, which Congress had expressly declined to do, as well as all subsidies.

Mr. President, even if Congress should entertain a subsidy program and appropriate the money, what farmer would take a subsidy if it were to be charged against him—put into one pocket and taken out of the other?

The order provided that all subsidies should be deducted. Certainly parity payments, incentive payments, bonuses, and bounties are subsidies. Everything added to the income which does not come from the market, but is added by the Government, is a subsidy, notwithstanding the fact that that word has become odious and an effort is now being made to sugar-coat it by calling it an incentive payment. The result is the same.

There has been considerable discussion with relation to subsidy payments. I am not as firm on that subject as is the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. I shall not take the time to go into a discussion of the question. I want the farmer to get his money in the market place, which is the proper place for him to get it. I do not want to require him to take up his time making out a lot of papers, or to have a great force of Government field agents checking the information received from him. If the market conditions, the supply and demand conditions, justify it, it is sound and just, and more satisfactory to the farmer to get his price in the market place rather than to come to the Government and ask for a check to make up the difference.

We cannot adopt a bonus, or subsidy, or incentive payment system under the order we are trying to repeal. I am calling attention to it in a friendly way because I am not so vigorously opposed to it if we can hold the prices down. I am not so strongly in favor of it. I merely mention it to show the majority leader the trouble we are drawn into today by the Executive order, in legislating on any program which seeks to change the present price situation. It has been called an incentive payment. Who will argue about it? Who will argue that under this order it must not be deducted from the parity price, or from the ceiling? Every amount which is paid in the form of a subsidy, as an incentive payment, for peanuts, potatoes, or anything else, under this order must be deducted from the parity price, and thereby bring down lower and lower the market and parity price, and especially the ceiling price.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say on the merits of this matter. In view of the variation between my information and that of the Senator from Kentucky about the number of non-cooperators among the farmers, I wish to put into the RECORD a statement showing that the number of farmers receiving soil-conservation payments is 5,956,206. The information of the Senator from Kentucky was that there were only 38 percent, I believe, not receiving benefit payments, and not participating in the soil-conservation program. It will be found that farmers all over the country are cooperating and participating in the receipt of soil-conservation payments.

The number of farmers receiving parity payments is 5,696,930. I have a list showing commodities participating in the receipt of soil-conservation payments, and the amount received for each of these commodities in 1941. I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1941 the following commodities received soil-conservation payments (including soil building.)

Number of farms receiving payments on these commodities not available: Cotton, corn, wheat, Irish potatoes, peanuts, rice, flue-cured tobacco, burley tobacco, all other tobacco, celery, commercial vegetables, general soil-depleting crops.

Number of farms receiving soil-conservation payments, 5,956,206.

In 1941 the following commodities received parity payments:

Cotton	2,553,703
Corn	1,196,094
Wheat	1,576,977
Rice	12,336
Flue-cured tobacco	274,361
Fire-cured tobacco	46,980
Other tobacco	36,487
Number of farms receiving parity payments	5,696,930

Figures not yet available for 1942 because they are still making 1942 payments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The source of the information which I have just asked to be printed in the RECORD is the statistical summary of 1941, Agricultural Service and Payment Program, November 1942, compiled in the Division of Special Programs of the triple A from the reports of county, State, and regional triple A offices.

Mr. President, in conclusion I will say that I have heretofore stated that the bill about which we have been debating is here as a farmers' bill. It is not my bill, nor the bill of any other individual. The farmers, through their organizations, were disturbed by the Executive order which upset and changed the farm program outlined in the price-control law. They had been in Washington and fought these issues, and had adjusted themselves to the law as it was passed by Congress and approved by the President. The President's Executive order was then issued, and it upset and changed the program. In the interest of fairness and in justice to them, the farmers thought that the views adopted by Congress and approved by the President did not need any Executive order changing them, and that they ought to stand as the Congress, after considerable debate, had adopted them. Through their organizations the farmers brought the bill to me. I introduced it, and Senators know the remainder of its history.

When it developed yesterday that the supporters of the bill would probably be unable to muster the necessary two-thirds vote to pass the bill over the President's veto, the question then arose as to what should be done. Everyone knew that there were varying opinions concerning the facts. Everyone knew that sets of figures were being presented; even the President said so in his message. Some indicated that large amounts of money were involved, and more or less inflation. But even the President himself was unable to make up his mind and state the specific facts to Congress. The whole issue was beclouded, and we all know that extraneous factors have entered the minds of Senators in their consideration of what they should do under all the circumstances. So it was decided that the bill and the message ought to be referred to the committee, in the interest of justice, in the interest of decent and fair legislation, in the interest of historical accuracy, in view of statements being presented here from high official sources which were totally challenged, which stand challenged today, and which were challenged yesterday. They may be right, they may be wrong; I shall not go into that argument now. There are great and fundamental variations in the information given to the Senate and in the constructions placed on certain facts which have been presented, so far as the inflationary effect is concerned.

Some Senators seem to think that a few cents increase in the prices paid to farmers for a few agricultural commodities would be greatly inflationary. Some say that the only inflationary factor of great importance—and I agree with them—is the amount of money in the pockets of the people so greatly in excess of the quantity of the goods which are available. That is the great factor which threatens inflation. But these questions are all involved. Men in high authority do not even agree on what constitutes inflation, and what factors are inflationary.

In justice to the farm group, let me say that they do not bring many requests to Congress for legislation. They are usually content to accept what comes to them, with humility, patriotism, and loyalty. This program was brought before five big farm organizations. As I have pointed out, in recent history they have not agreed on anything else. They agreed on this program, not because it involved any large increase in the farmer's income. As we all knew, it involved more the source of their income than it did the amount they were to receive. But they thought it was unfair and unjust. In justice to them, in justice to Senators who will vote to recommit this bill, and who would gladly vote to override the President's veto, the farm organizations to which I have referred—and I am speaking for them by their authority—would like to have the bill sent to the committee, in view of the controversies involving not only principles, but important facts, all of which have been developed, most of which have been developed since the bill was vetoed and returned to the Senate. What harm could result from such action? In the first place, we are not on the verge of any runaway inflation which will take place overnight, as some people thought when

we undertook last October to change the price-control law.

Permit me to read one statement from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics which will probably surprise a great many people who are almost ready to cry over the inflation now in effect. Inflation may come; I do not know. God knows I pray that it may not. But it does not hurt anyone to know the facts. During the past winter there were probably outrageous increases on the part of retailers in the prices of seasonal vegetables. There were severe freezes in the South which destroyed many of the vegetables and fruits which are shipped to the northern sections of the country at this time of the year. This condition probably resulted in an undue and unnecessary rise in the prices of certain commodities which go to the consumer's table.

What I wish to read is from the official issue of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics on agricultural prices, a bulletin issued once every month, and distributed widely. Let me read the first few sentences:

> The general level of prices received by farmers in mid-March was 182 percent of the 1914–19 average, the United States Department of Agriculture reported today. An advance of 4 points from February 15 wiped out a decrease of 4 points during the previous month and restored the index to the level reached on January 15.

We are right now where we were on January 15, according to the official declaration of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and but for the rise in price, as they state here, as a result of the increase in the price of meat, there would have been a decrease in the last 2 months instead of wild inflation, as some people seem to thing is now prevalent.

These are the official records. Inflation may come, I do not know, but there is no harm in sending the bill back to to the committee, and letting the facts be developed. I am sure that no one is afraid of having the facts developed. I do not think anyone will vote against sending the bill back on that account.

Some may think they have the farmer where he cannot get out because he cannot get a two-thirds vote here at this time, and he may never be able to get a two-thirds vote. But a new issue is presented by the veto. The situation is different now, there are different facts presented.

Mr. President, I have made a motion to refer the bill to the committee, so that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may explore the whole field, bring the statisticians and economists before it, and do the best the committee—which is a good committee—can do to get the real truth of the situation. If the committee shall decide the bill should be reconsidered by the Senate, the committee can bring the bill back. I am sure there will be no hurry about it, and that the committee's conclusion will be judicially arrived at. If the committee shall decide the bill does not deserve further consideration, of course, it will not bring the bill back to the Senate.

Mr. President, I think we should have a record vote on the motion, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reed
Bailey	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lodge	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Chandler	McCarran	Tydings
Chavez	McClellan	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Wagner
Connally	McNary	Wallgren
Danaher	Maloney	Walsh
Davis	Mead	Wheeler
Downey	Millikin	Wherry
Eastland	Moore	White
Ellender	Murdock	Wiley
Ferguson	Nye	Willis
George	O'Daniel	Wilson
Gerry	O'Mahoney	
Gillette	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to refer Senate bill 660, with the accompanying veto message, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have a pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY]. I am advised that if present the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea." I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on an inspection tour of military camps.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, holding hearings in the West on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate Small Business Enterprises.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has been called out of the city on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Florida would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] if present would vote "nay." I am advised that if present the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness. He is paired on this question with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO]. If present the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay" and I am advised the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—62

Aiken	Hayden	Revercomb
Austin	Hill	Reynolds
Ball	Holman	Robertson
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bone	La Follette	Shipstead
Brewster	Langer	Smith
Brooks	Lucas	Stewart
Bushfield	McCarran	Taft
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Vandenberg
Connally	Moore	Van Nuys
Downey	Murdock	Wallgren
Eastland	Nye	Wheeler
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wherry
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Willis
Gillette	Radcliffe	Wilson
Hawkes	Reed	

NAYS—23

Bailey	Gerry	Maloney
Barkley	Green	Mead
Bridges	Guffey	Truman
Burton	Gurney	Tunnell
Chandler	Hatch	Wagner
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Walsh
Danaher	Kilgore	White
Davis	Lodge	

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews	Caraway	Pepper
Barbour	Glass	Scrugham
Bilbo	Maybank	Tobey
Buck	Murray	

So, Senate bill 660, with the accompanying veto message, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider House Joint Resolution 96, Calendar No. 158.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I understand it is not the desire of the Senator from Georgia to proceed with the measure today?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no intention of proceeding with the joint resolution today, but should like to have it made the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The title of the joint resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that on completion of the consideration of House Joint Resolution 96 tomorrow, which I believe will take only a few minutes, it is the intention to take up the Federal pay bill which is on the calendar, Senate bill 635. Probably a House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill, but that will be the subject matter for consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment.

INSTRUCTION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] submitted a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, in regard to the subject of history teaching in the United States public schools. This morning's New York Times contained a summary of comment among educators concerning this question. The lead of the story begins:

Praising the New York Times survey of college freshman knowledge of United States history as a "real service to education," prominent educators joined yesterday in urging that the subject be given greater stress both in high school and in college.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be incorporated in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATORS PRAISE UNITED STATES HISTORY TEST—NEW YORK TIMES SURVEY TERMED A "REAL SERVICE"—BLAME FOR IGNORANCE ANALYZED—POOR TEACHING CHARGED—OTHER PROBABLE CAUSES GIVEN AS HEAVY SCHEDULES, DISLIKE OF "ANNOYING FACTS"

Praising the New York Times survey of college freshman knowledge of United States history as a "real service to education," prominent educators joined yesterday in urging that the subject be given greater stress both in high school and in college. A charge was made that many teachers are doing a "poor job" in this field and were allowing students to "get by" with a minimum of effort.

In the study, made public Sunday, it was found that a majority of college freshmen have little knowledge about important historical events or figures connected with the United States. Seven thousand freshmen, in 36 representative colleges and universities, were examined.

Commenting on the survey, Dean William F. Russell of Teachers College, Columbia University, declared that the New York Times "has done a real service in calling to our attention the need for knowledge of American history." He remarked that at present we know "too little of it" but need to know much more.

CONDITION IS ANALYZED

"I am confident that the issue is not whether ignorance of American history is the result of the practice of teaching history, geography, economics, and civics in close relation to each other under such a title as "social studies" or of following the older procedure of teaching each subject separately," Dean Russell said.

Teachers College has had professors advocating each plan. Prof. Henry Johnson believed in the subject approach. Lincoln School has followed the social-studies plan.

"The real cause of our ignorance, not only in history, but of science and other fields, can be found in our short school year, our plan of four subjects taught five times a week in high school (with English, foreign language, and mathematics taking the bulk of the time), the poor pay of our teachers so that they cannot afford adequate postgraduate training, the large size of classes, and the excessive proportion of pupils taking academic rather than vocational classes.

"I am confident that if we should follow the plan of the progressive school where there is a core curriculum occupying about half of the time, devoted to the sciences, history, economics, geography, civics, and personal health and welfare; when this is required of every pupil every year; when this is taught by well-educated teachers, then the products of our schools will know enough to be good citizens."

SEES SERVICE DONE

Asserting that ignorance of the Nation's growth, institutions, and traditions is "dangerous from the point of view of the development of democracy," Prof. Robert G. Caldwell, dean of humanities, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, declared that the Times' survey has "rendered a real service to American education."

Dean Caldwell placed the blame for student's lack of knowledge of American history on the teachers of the subject. In secondary schools, he said, a "poor job" of teaching can be found which allows youth to get by in the course with a minimum of effort. He charged that colleges have not all set as high standards in their history requirements as they have in mathematics and other sciences.

"The colleges and universities, yes, and the American people," he added, "are slipping in their standards. As a matter of fact, there are some that do not care for history. High schools can improve the teaching of American history by cutting down on wasted motion."

To remedy the existing situation which the Times disclosed, Dean Caldwell recommended higher standards for teachers and higher standards of accomplishments. Commenting on the questionnaire, Dean Caldwell asserted that "as a whole most questions were well chosen."

"The general impression one may gather from the survey is that American high-school youth has enough courses in history but that the students have not been held up in standards as they have in the fields of science.

"We can remedy the situation by getting better teachers with higher standards and by having the colleges adopt higher standards. I do not believe that we need any legislation for making our students more history conscious."

Observing that he was "not in the least surprised" by the results of the Times survey, Dean Alexander Baltziy, acting chairman of the history department at New York University's Washington Square College, predicted that a survey of students' knowledge of English or of any other subject would have the same results. His own students, who are largely graduates of the New York City school system, "are as bad as the rest," he said.

"In our schools there is an evident disrespect for 'annoying' facts on the part of the faculty, the curriculum makers, and the students," Dean Baltzly said. "It's so much easier to talk about a nice, long-term trend. Indeed it's an axiom in educational circles that college students are unable to read, write, or figure and that they are ignorant of geography. Of course, these students would be better prepared if high schools would eliminate the fancy stuff and teach those four skills.

"Our educational system is based on the premise that the student will read at home and will acquire some fund of knowledge independently. This is not the case, however, for many students come from homes where they do not learn the fundamentals. Why, I spend most of my time looking for English mistakes in my students' papers."

SUBJECT HELD UNSTYLISH

Dr. Andre A. Beaumont, Jr., associate professor of history at New York University, declared that the results of the survey have confirmed him in his belief that United States history has become an "unstylish" subject.

"The blame for the students' poor showing in the Times survey should be laid on the curriculum planners," Dr. Beaumont said. "Good, sound courses in American history are rare in our high schools. I do not think that the subsidiary school sciences are of much value without a sound background of political history, and I do not believe that the average high school history course could have prepared students for answering questions such as those asked on the Times questionnaire."

Revision of high school curriculums should be the first step taken to correct students' ignorance of our history, according to Dr. Beaumont. He declared that "then, when they have acquired this framework of knowledge, it will be time enough to teach them the subsidiary social sciences."

Disagreeing with Dr. Beaumont's interpretation of the survey, Prof. Clyde Eagleton of the government department at New York University, said that "students have had enough history to understand our traditions." He added that he had no use for the idea that students must be taught, in great detail, the lives and works of all the great men of the past.

"On the contrary," he held, "courses in American history should contain a lot more civics to prepare the student to become an intelligent voter. If anything, we need to put more emphasis on contemporary problems."

PRAISES AROUSING OF PUBLIC

"The New York Times has made a real contribution in arousing the public to the existing urgent need for more attention to United States history," Jacob I. Hartstein, assistant professor of education at Long Island University and Yeshiva College, declared. "Educators generally," he said, "must pay more attention to the methods and materials which contribute to a development of an appreciation of our democracy."

"This can be developed through an intimate acquaintance of our Nation's inspiring past," Professor Hartstein asserted. "This need has never been greater nor the time more appropriate."

"American history should be taught with the idea of making the youth of the country more world-minded," Prof. Nelson P. Mead, chairman of the history department at City College, declared. He pointed out that "even the most rabid isolationist must admit today that this country is destined to play a significent if not determining role in world-wide problems at the close of this war.

"A narrow nationalistic study of American history is not likely to prepare young men and women to play an intelligent part in helping to solve the serious problems which will confront the country when the war is over," Dr. Mead said.

According to Dr. Mead, American youth must become familiar with the history of the United States relations with the rest of the world if a lasting peace is to be concluded. He recalled that before the First

World War the American people were abysmally ignorant concerning international relations and that our refusal to join the League of Nations was a natural result of this lack of information.

Dr. Mead condemned the high schools for their tendency to dilute American history by teaching mainly general concepts and underemphasizing familiarity with factual material. He said that only in the most recent textbooks has adequate consideration been given to the past and present relations of the United States with the rest of the world.

The findings of the Times survey merits the serious consideration of American high-school teachers, Dr. Alonzo F. Myers, chairman of the higher education department of New York University, declared. It would appear evident, he said, that some high schools have given inadequate time to this subject and that some of the teachers have been inadequately prepared to teach history.

"The findings of this survey certainly provide excellent justification for greater attention to American history in our colleges," Professor Myers said. "Furthermore, they appear to provide an argument for much greater attention to the social sciences in connection with the Army and Navy program for the 18- and 19-year-old youths who are to be sent back to college."

ROOM SEEN FOR IMPROVEMENT

Although the conditions of secondary school education in American history may not be as bad as the figures brought out by The Times survey, there is certainly room for improvement, Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve of Barnard College observed yesterday to an all-college assembly. Students who do not know that Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States during the Civil War are hardly material for thoughtful and wise citizens, she said.

The survey, she continued, indicates some great lack in secondary school education, a fogginess on the part of high school graduates concerning facts which are fundamental to every American's education. However, this lack of knowledge is not applicable only to American history, she indicated, but to mathematics, foreign languages, or English.

It is obvious, Dean Gildersleeve said, that although some of the secondary school training is excellent, it can and certainly must be improved. These students must learn to discipline their minds and to be accurate on at least certain essential facts, she held.

The East Orange Board of Education, following a discussion of the survey, has instructed Superintendent of Schools Henry Kentopp to call a conference of all school principals in the local system to determine means of providing more adequate teaching of United States history. The board asked that particular attention be paid to stressing the subject in the two senior high schools in the city.

The conference will be called as soon as it can be arranged, Dr. Kentopp said. A special conference to consider the Times survey and its implications to education will be held under the auspices of Fairleigh Dickinson Junior College, Rutherford, N. J., on Monday afternoon, Dr. Peter Sammartino, president, announced. Prominent educators in New Jersey and outside of the State have been invited to participate.

In an editorial appearing yesterday, the Washington Post said that the New York Times' test revealing a great lack of knowledge of American history is disheartening, not so much because of the lack of factual knowledge displayed as because of the implied lack of grasp of the meaning of the great events of our history.

"If our students had received the right kind of instruction," the editorial said, "they would not have forgotten so speedily the accomplishments of our national leaders."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

The following-named officers for temporary appointment as brigadier generals in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law:

Col. Arthur Ringland Harris, Field Artillery; and

Col. Claude Mitchell Adams (lieutenant colonel), Army of the United States.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

John L. Thomas, to be postmaster at Bevier, Mo., in place of Ordell Gross, removed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committee, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence Mullins to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edmund J. Brandon to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Irving J. Higbee to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Philip to be United States attorney for the district of South Dakota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles W. Robertson to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Fannie Dixon Welch to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that Calendar Nos. 677, 679, and 680 be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs. In that connection, I may say that the chairman of the committee has no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, what are the nominations?

Mr. McCARRAN. They come under the heading "War Manpower Commission."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the other nominations in the War Manpower Commission be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the other nominations in the War Manpower Commission are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Osborne B. Hardison to be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the nomination be confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of April 6), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Patrick Thomas Fagan, from the State of Pennsylvania, to be area director, at $6,500

April

purposes," as amended, to provide for the grade of commodore, and for other purposes;

S. 853. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of January 23, 1942, providing for the sale of naval stores, in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the sale of naval stores in the continental United States during the war and 6 months thereafter to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to other persons at stations where purchase from private agencies is found to be impracticable;

S. 886. An act relating to the selective-service deferment, on occupational grounds, of persons employed by the Federal Government; and

S. 903. An act to amend section 602 (d) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY (for Mr. BARBOUR):

S. 979. A bill granting a pension to Ralph L. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 980. A bill to provide for placing the name of Lloyd Weeks Benedict upon the emergency officers' retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. BONE, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 981. A bill to assist in relieving economic distress in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by providing work for unemployed persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 982. A bill to provide that the unexpended proceeds from the sale of 50-cent pieces coined in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Albany, New York, may be paid into the general funds of such city; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS FOR PENALTIES AND DAMAGES ARISING FROM FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McNARY (for Mr. BARBOUR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BARBOUR to the bill (S. 920) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, last Friday I inserted in the RECORD a statement setting out indications of bias in the abstracts from publications dealing with post-war programs, issued by the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Library of Congress. The Director of the Bureau, Mr. Griffith, in a personal interview denied any intentional bias in that work, and I offered to submit for inclusion in the RECORD any statement he might wish to make in regard to the matter.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by Mr. Griffith in a letter he wrote me under date of April 6. The statement by the Director, however, is not a conclusive answer to the chief point raised in my statement.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, April 6, 1943.

The Honorable RAYMOND E. WILLIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You have been good enough to call my attention to the extension of your remarks which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1943, and to ask me for any comments or additional facts bearing upon the subject. However, before proceeding to the main topic, I do want to thank you sincerely for your very kind remarks concerning the Legislative Reference Service. We try to give the Members the assistance which they desire, and recognize that impartiality and the absence of any suggestions of propaganda are absolutely essential to our operations.

It is for this reason that I welcome the opportunity to clarify the relationship of the State Department to the abstracts which we prepare of publications relating to post-war problems. Some misunderstanding must account for the statement that the selection of materials to abstract is determined "in every instance * * * by agents of the State Department and the Office for Emergency Management." The selection is made by and in the Library, and the only stipulation which the State Department makes is that the articles, books, and documents selected for abstracting shall contain within them some significant contribution toward the analysis or solution of post-war problems. In furtherance of this instruction, our staff members strive to examine all the material in print (except newspapers) which comes into the Library every day. In what is currently available in published form, during the few months in which this project has been operating, there have been only a few items hostile to the administration's stated policies in the fields of international trade and peace aims. The complete absence on the part of the Legislative Reference Service of any bias one way or the other can be best indicated by the inclusion in the abstracts of a very considerable number of articles which are antiadministration in some of the other fields.

I must assume personal responsibility for the particular six samples which were circulated to the Members of Congress. Attempt was made to include a crosssection of material as it was being received, so that the Members might know what to expect if they wished to receive copies of the abstracts. The most careful rereading of them does not suggest to me that they have a bias in any one direction. Certainly none was intended, nor were any of our workers conscious of bias.

You quite properly raise the question as to why we abstract the State Department's own publications. The reason is quite a simple one. So many of the Federal agencies are, at the present time, giving attention to the problems of demobilization, the unscrambling of wartime controls, and probable conditions in the international field, that the abstracts are used, not by the State Department alone, but by a number of other research bureaus within the Government. To these other bureaus, an abstract of a State Department publication is a quick and convenient way of learning its contents. The project as originally conceived and as now carried out is intended to avoid serious duplication and to make it unnecessary for several agencies themselves to try to discover and analyze what is appearing in print of interest to their special assignments. The Library of Congress seems to be the most appropriate agency to examine virtually the entire flow of printed materials for this purpose.

Once more let me thank you for your courtesy in the matter and for your words of appreciation.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

FUEL OIL SITUATION IN THE EASTERN TERRITORY

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have made a part of my remarks in the RECORD a very interesting and encouraging letter which I received today from Mr. John J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads. It is a short letter, and I shall read it. It is as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: You will recall that I appeared before the Special Committee to Investigate Gasoline and Fuel Oil Shortages on January 27 and outlined to the committee what had been accomplished by the railroads up to that time in moving oil into the eastern territory and what we hoped to accomplish in the future.

In this connection you will, I am sure, be interested in knowing that for the week ended April 3 the railroads handled into the eastern territory an average of 933,966 barrels per day. The daily average in tank cars for that week was 912,919 barrels and handled in drums moving in boxcars 21,047 barrels.

This is the peak record up to date in the movement of oil by rail into the eastern territory, the previous peak being for the week ended September 19, 1942, when the daily average was 856,710 barrels. You may be assured the railroads will do everything that can be done not only to continue this record but to better it in the months that lie ahead.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. PELLEY.

Mr. President, I should like to add that, in view of this very encouraging letter, plus the fact that the so-called 20-inch pipeline to the east coast has been approved and that the larger pipeline, the so-called big inch line, will be completed this year, the oil situation in the distressed area, not taking into consideration the needs of the military forces, looks much more encouraging than it has.

STATUS OF NEGROES AND OTHER MINORITY GROUPS IN ARMED SERVICES AND WOMEN'S AFFILIATED AUXILIARY MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 132), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or a subcommittee thereof, to consist of five members, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the status of the Negro and other minority groups in the armed services and in attached or affiliated auxiliary military organizations for women, with a

view to ascertaining (a) the extent of compliance by the armed services and the Selective Service System with the requirement of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, that the selection and training of men be accomplished without racial discrimination, (b) the nature and extent of any practices in the organization and placement of personnel which accomplish the exclusion of persons because of race or color from the assignment to any type of unit or any type of service on land, at sea, or in the air, (c) the extent to which opportunities for training, appointment, or advancement in the commissioned grades are restricted on the basis of race or color, (d) the extent to which considerations of race or color are impeding the full utilization and development of professional and technical skills, and (e) the relation of the system of segregated units to the effective utilization and appropriate placement of persons on the basis of individual competency and merit. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $1,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

WINNING THE PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Winning the Peace," delivered by Senator WAGNER on April 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICANISM VERSUS INTERNATIONALISM IN THE POST-WAR PICTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Americanism versus Internationalism in the Post-war Picture," delivered by him on the Washington Evening Star Forum on April 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of post-war problems, delivered by Senator TAFT on the Washington Evening Star Forum on April 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE EAU CLAIRE (WIS.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Small Business Must Not Be an Unnecessary War Casualty," delivered by him before the Eau Claire (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce on March 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN ADDITIONAL WEAPON FOR JAPAN—ARTICLE BY SENATOR LA FOLLETTE

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by him, entitled "An Additional Weapon for Japan," publish in the Progressive for Monday, April 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POETIC TRIBUTE TO FATHER DUFFY

[Mr. MCNARY (for Mr. BARBOUR) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Father Duffy," composed by Martin M. Clifford, past State chairman of the Knights of Columbus of Jersey City, N. J., which appears in the Appendix.]

PALESTINE A PLACE OF REFUGE FOR THE JEWS—ARTICLE BY JAMES G. MCDONALD

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by James G. McDonald entitled "The Time for Discussion Is Past," published in the March 9, 1943, issue of the New Palestine, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR PRODUCTION AND LABOR—ADDRESS BY L. METCALFE WALLING

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of current war production and labor, delivered by L. Metcalfe Walling, Administrator, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, United States Department of Labor, at Springfield, Mass., March 5, 1943, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PHONEY WAR ON INFLATION—ARTICLE BY MERLO PUSEY

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an article by Merlo Pusey, entitled "Phoney War on Inflation," published in the Washington Post, of April 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS JEFFERSON BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an article by Will P. Kennedy dealing with the activities of the late Representative John J. Boylan, of New York, in connection with the celebration of the bicentennial of Thomas Jefferson, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONOPOLY AND BUREAUCRACY—EDITORIAL FROM "AMERICA"

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Monopoly and Bureaucracy" published in "America," which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTION OF HENRYK ERLICH AND VICTOR ALTER—REMARKS BY DAVID DUBINSKY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, remarks made by David Dubinsky at a meeting of protest against the execution of Henryk Erlich and Victor Alter, which appear in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION AND COLLABORATION OF UNITED NATIONS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Give It a Hearing," from the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, of March 30, 1943, and an editorial entitled "The Senate Answers the Challenge" from the Norwalk (Ohio) Experiment, of April 1, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute. If any amendment is to be proposed to the committee amendment, it should be offered before a vote is had on the committee amendment.

NORWAY'S DAY OF SORROW

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, tomorrow will be the 9th of April, a day which looms large in the history of this country and looms large in the history of a little country across the water. That country is Norway.

The destiny of the free people of Norway has been forever joined to the destiny of the free people of the United States by the inexorable hand of God.

Norway and the United States have the same allies—the United Nations.

The United States and Norway have a common foe—the Axis.

We even share the same day of sorrow, April 9.

On April 9, 1940, Hitler's forces, with the aid of Quisling's Judases, violated the shores of neutral Norway.

On April 9, 1942, the United States War Department announced the fall of Bataan in the Philippines after 3 months of heroic resistance.

April 9, 1943, Bataan and Norway are still in the grasp of our barbarian enemies. But today the growing might of American production and American arms is striking at the Axis; its supreme goal the liberation of all Axis-subjugated peoples all over the world.

Norwegians are doing their part to win this victory. Norwegians are serving in the air, on the sea, and on the land under the banners of Norway and of other United Nations. Norwegian ships and Norwegian sailors carry American war materials to every fighting front. And in Norway itself resistance is going on—and it will go on until the last vestige of Axis oppression is destroyed for all time.

When the enemy launched his sneak attack on the Norwegian coast on the night before April 9, 1940, he lost between one-fourth and one-third of his then existing fleet, a fact not generally known. From that moment forward, the people of Norway have never neglected an opportunity to attack the invader.

Quisling was immediately put in power by the Nazi, but his short-lived cabinet was never able to assemble, and 6 days later the initial quisling government was forced to resign. King Haakon was the constitutional monarch of Norway. He continues to be the constitutional monarch of that nation. The pretense at government which the Nazi-Quislings set up is, in the eyes of the world, as it is in the minds of the Norwegian people, unconstitutional and illegal, commanding neither obedience nor respect.

In this connection, I should like to read an open letter to Vidkun Quisling, whose name has displaced even that of Judas as the very symbol of betrayal, from Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States. The letter is contained in an official publication of the Royal Norwegian Government under date of April

9. I now quote the letter, which is addressed to Vidkun Quisling:

When for the love of power, a man attempts to sell the dignity of his own people, Vidkun Quisling, he sells nothing but his own soul.

For a brief moment he wields the sword; but it is a lonely, meaningless gesture, Vidkun Quisling, and the command meets only the silence of a contemptuous world.

Borrowed armor is a deadly thing, Vidkun Quisling. It is no firmer than the source from which it came. It falls apart and leaves him who has worn it against his own people, naked, alone, unready for the wrath of men whose freedom and dignity are beyond price.

The source from which you borrowed strength is waning, Vidkun Quisling. Already there are cracks in the armor and the contempt of the world, the wrath of men is unabated.

You are ruling, Vidkun Quisling, past the hour. You are living, Vidkun Quisling, on borrowed time. You have spent, Vidkun Quisling, the last of the 30 pieces of silver.

If this is the contempt of the Attorney General of the United States, how much more terrible must be the surging hatred of the Norwegians themselves.

No loyal Norwegian has cooperated with Quisling or with his master, Hitler. Every loyal Norwegian has struck back at the traitor and the barbarians he represents with all the vigor that characterized the Vikings of old—the Vikings who discovered America, the Vikings who, in 1066, invaded England, after having lived for a generation in France, the Vikings who in 750 settled in Dublin and in Cork.

Quisling tried to appease the nearly 300,000 members of the National Athletic Association by means ranging from bribery to threats of death, or prison camps. Since 1940, not one athletic contest has taken place in Norway in which the contestants were Norwegians.

When he was foiled in his attempt to gain control of the membership of the National Labor Federation, which had a membership of approximately 350,000, the puppet traitor brought about the reduction of wages and an arbitrary raising of living costs. But, he could not break the undying spirit of the Norwegian workingman. Norwegian workers, today, are the spearhead of the living movement of resistance which will eventually bury the Quisling movement.

Wounded by his failure to enslave mature Norwegians, Quisling aimed a Herod's blow at Norwegian children. He decreed that the children between the ages of 10 and 18 years, should become members of the Ungdomsfykling, a youth organization patterned after the Nazi Jugend. He decreed that teachers must join the Nazi-controlled Norges Larersamband—Norway's teachers organization. As a protest, 12,000 of Norway's 14,000 teachers resigned, and more than 700 teachers were sent to the concentration camp near Lillehammer. After weeks of torture, those who remained alive of the 700 were shipped off to a work camp near the Finnish border. Yet, the teachers who were not imprisoned or killed resisted and continued to resist.

Quisling tried to force his master's new order upon the Norwegian Church. He suspended the pledge of silence which Norwegian law required of all clergymen concerning facts confided in them by their parishioners. As a consequence of this move, 7 bishops and 1,100 pastors resigned. The Norwegian Church is a church of God and of free men, not of idols and of slaves who cringe before them. The world knew that. Vidkun Quisling has learned to his sorrow that from the blood of a single martyr there spring a thousand true believers.

Every action of the slave betrayer has been met with stubborn disobedience. Five political parties, representing 92 percent of the voters of Norway, united to oppose him. He disbanded this united organization. The disbanded group still continued to checkmate him at every turn.

He attempted to intervene in local and district governments, only to encounter mass resignations of governors and mayors.

Norway's national legislative body, the Riksting, has confounded Quisling by suspending its operations indefinitely.

Since December 12, 1940, Norway's Supreme Court has refused to meet.

Quisling cannot control organizations and groups which have, voluntarily, and as an attack upon him and the evil which he represents, gone out of existence.

I know the immeasurable strength of the Norwegian character—as certain, as powerful as the sea that breaks against the bounds of their native fjords. I know that strength because both my parents were born in Norway.

The people of the State of Wisconsin, which I have the honor, in part, to represent, appreciate the deep-rooted democracy of the Norwegian people. The many thousands of American citizens of Norwegian ancestry who live in my home State have made lasting contributions to its progress and its greatness.

And the people of the United States, in common with all right-thinking people everywhere, are well aware of the manner in which Norwegian resistance has aided the cause of the United Nations.

When the Axis is crushed, defeated by triumphant United Nations, Norwegians can attend a pure church, send their children to the instruction of loyal teachers, resume honest work and honest recreation, and live under a government which has denied the right of invaders to defile it.

Norway will see that day of restoration and liberation.

The United States, with men and machines, will hasten the coming of that day.

Norway and the United States have shared the day of sorrow—April 9.

Through trial and torture and punishment and pain, our two nations will fight side by side, together, until we and all United Nations share another day, the day of victory.

RESTRICTION OF POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I want to make it plain at once that I am shocked by the War Department order of recent date that "no member of the military forces on active duty will hereafter become a candidate for or seek or accept election to any public office not held by him when he entered upon active duty." I can understand the necessity for discouraging ordinary political activities on the part of members of the armed forces. But this order nullifies the fundamental rights of American citizenship. It inhibits, furthermore, the rights of our whole people to turn to the military establishment for high leadership in civilian places of high authority if civilian judgment wants to turn in that direction. I deny the right of the War Department to militarize the processes of American democracy. I deny the right of the War Department thus indirectly to control American elections. I think I can understand the purpose. But I, for one, repudiate it. If the American people ever desire to draft a member of the military forces for high American responsibility, it will take more than the petty dictum of the War Department to deny them this high privilege. We are not yet totally at the mercy of our self-serving overlords. If a great American emerges, for example, as the next, most eligible President of the United States, the War Department cannot stop him just because he happens to be a member of the military forces on active duty, and it will make a blunder, as ineffectual as it will be transparent, if it tries.

THE FARMER AND INFLATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Senate an interesting statement by the Northeastern Dairy Conference just received by me. In this statement I find four questions asked, as follows:

1. How can farmers be the cause of inflation when they are selling their farms to go to work in factories?
2. How can farmers be the cause of inflation when dairy herds are being sold because of insufficient returns to pay bills and hired labor?
3. How can farmers be the cause of inflation when the farm has been stripped and is continuing to be stripped of hired labor by the attractiveness of factory jobs?
4. How long would the protected industrial worker stand it if he worked 80 hours per week instead of 48; if he worked for approximately one-half of what he is now getting and then was called insulting names?

Mr. President, to some it may seem that the picture here given is very much overdrawn, but those acquainted with the farm situation at present realize that many farmers see it just about that way.

All efforts to find a "class goat" for inflation are unfair and in the long run will fail. We have inflation for a very simple reason. The Federal Government is paying out money now at the rate of $100,000,000,000 a year instead of approximately $10,000,000,000 a year.

National income payments to individuals have gone up from $76,000,000,000 to approximately $115,000,000,000 in 2 years. National income payments to individuals this year promises to go to $13,000,000,000 and, perhaps, to $140,000,000,000.

At the same time the amount of goods and services for which these tremendous sums in purchasing power can be exchanged has dropped by one-third; by

the end of this year perhaps it will be cut by almost one-half.

Price controls and wage controls, applied simultaneously and reasonably, if made in time, can retard the progress of inflation. So can taxation, if the taxation is applied where the increases in income are the largest. The Government has, so far, done none of these things.

A year ago price controls on commodities were initiated. But wage controls were not attempted, and then only half-heartedly, until months later. Of course, wage increases, especially in total volume of wages paid, increased production costs as well as purchasing power. Prices beat against ceilings, naturally. As this process continues, prices and wages will continue to advance alternately but steadily.

The remedy is not to attach the blame to the farmer, nor to any one group, but to try to prevent the spread between supply and purchasing power from increasing still further.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the pending legislation deals with one of the most critical aspects of the manpower problem. It undertakes to supply funds and to provide some machinery to assist in securing sufficient farm labor for the production and the harvesting of essential agricultural crops.

It is unnecessary for me to discuss the importance of increased agricultural production in the present very unusual period of our national history. The fact that the available labor on the farms of the Nation has been seriously depleted both by reason of the more attractive wages offered in industry as well as by having workers drawn into the armed forces is a matter of common knowledge. Various surveys indicate that there is a shortage of from 700,000 to 1,000,000 in the manpower necessary to be had on the farms of the country in order to reach the production goals which have been set by the Department of Agriculture.

The hearings before the committee demonstrated that the farmers are preparing large areas for planting. With good luck, a slight increase in the amount of machinery, and an increase in the labor supply, despite all the difficulties which confront the farmers it is not at all impossible that they will reach the high goals which have been fixed for this year's production.

Some months ago the responsibility for the recruitment and placement of farm labor was transferred from the Manpower Commission to the Department of Agriculture. A few weeks ago the Honorable Chester C. Davis was appointed the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution, and was charged with the responsibility of assisting the farmers of the country to secure adequate labor for the production and harvesting of their crops.

The pending measure appropriates funds to assist in that movement. The original Budget estimates which were sent to the House requested an appropriation of $65,000,000. The measure as it passed the House carried an appropriation of $26,100,000. After very careful consideration, the Senate committee recommends to the Senate an appropriation of $40,000,000, which is more than the amount carried in the joint resolution as it passed the House, but is a considerable amount below the Budget request and the estimate of the sum necessary to be had in order to do the work.

The Senate will observe that the joint resolution as reported by the Senate committee is really in two parts. The first part relates to the recruitment and placement of farm labor within the several States and within the counties of the several States. The committee was of the opinion that the county extension agents and the State extension services would be better informed as to the available supplies of labor, as well as to where the labor was most needed, than would any other agency. We have, therefore, made available to the State extension services not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000 of the funds that are appropriated. It is estimated that from 85 to 90 percent of the labor which will be secured will be obtained within the several States. Most of it will of necessity be recruited locally.

We had before us a number of the directors of the extension services of the States. Many of the States have already formulated programs and have made considerable progress. The boys and girls in the high schools have been enrolled in a corps of farm workers. Several of the States have passed local laws which permit the children in the schools to be absent for as long as 30 days at one time, provided they are engaged in agricultural labor under the specified supervision. Some of the States, notably New York and California, have not only passed laws but have provided appropriations for the maintenance of local committees that are attempting to grapple with this very serious problem of the shortage of labor.

Now, we are very hopeful that with the plans which have been formulated and with the work which has been done, the county agents will, from the schools and from among the people with farm experience who are living in small towns, be able to secure large labor resources.

The other program relates to the activities of the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the first section, will he yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has indicated that he thought that, speaking generally, from 80 to 90 percent of the labor would be obtained in the local areas involved. Is there to be an importation from outside the country of the balance of the necessary labor?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was just approaching that subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Agreements have already been entered into with the Republic of Mexico whereby it is hoped to secure at least 50,000 Mexican laborers for the crops raised principally in the Southwest and in the sugar-beet areas. An agreement has been entered into with the colonial government of the Bahama Islands whereby 5,000 experienced farm workers from those islands will be brought into this country. I understand that the first load of them is now on the way, and it is proposed that they shall start work on the vegetable crops in Florida, and will work their way up the entire Atlantic seaboard, working on the crops as they mature in different periods, and perhaps going as far north as the State of New York and other States in that locality.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. However, there is nothing in the measure to prevent the importation of workers from any country; is there? In other words, if the Administrator desired to send to Europe and to bring into this country citizens or persons living in Europe, there is nothing in the measure which would prevent him from doing so; is there?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; there is nothing in it which would prevent him from bringing in anyone who is not an alien enemy. No citizen of a country with which the United States is at war can be brought in under this measure; but I may say that as a practical matter it would be almost impossible today to transport labor from Europe to this country, in view of the fact that every country in Europe has a much greater manpower problem than does the United States. They need all available labor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What about the refugees from Europe who seek entry here?

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that there is nothing in the joint resolution as I now recall, which would prevent the importation under a temporary entry permit of any foreigner who is not a national of a country with which we are now at war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me ask whether the joint resolution would suspend in any degree the immigration laws?

Mr. RUSSELL. It only suspends the immigration laws to the extent that it would waive the head tax on the persons brought in for this purpose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But it would not suspend the quota system, would it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; it would not suspend the quota system. I appreciate that suggestion from the Senator from Michigan.

I may say to the Senator from West Virginia that, of course, no number of aliens could be brought in in excess of the number allowed under the quota for the country from which they derive their nationality.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the point.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator mean that there is a limitation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course. There is nothing in the measure which would suspend any of the quota laws. The quotas do not apply to Mexico or to the Central American republics; but there is nothing in the joint resolution which would suspend the quotas which were established by the basic immigration act of 1924 or which would increase the number who could come in under the quota system. There is that limitation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator feel that the immigration laws would not be suspended by implication if we should give the Administrator power to bring in persons from other countries as they may be needed?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly do not believe that the joint resolution would suspend by implication the Immigration Act of 1924 as to quotas. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would suspend or in any wise affect the quota system. The Senator is well aware that there is no quota in the case of Mexico and the other American Republics. The quotas apply only to Europe, and there is a provision against the importation of Asiatics. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would suspend the quotas even if, as a practical matter, it were possible to bring in aliens from Europe.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is it not a fact that the contract which has been entered into with the Republic of Mexico provides for the return of the laborers when they are no longer needed in the United States?

Mr. RUSSELL. All the contracts provide for the return of the laborers to the country of their origin, whether it be Mexico or the Bahama Islands. Not only do the contracts so provide, but the Administrator has placed the imported agricultural laborers under the direction of a United States Army officer, with the idea that he will see that they are kept together and properly provided for, and that after they have performed their services in this country they will be returned to the country of their origin.

Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that as a practical matter it is not contemplated that laborers will be brought from Europe. In addition, it would be practically impossible to get them out of Europe, because all the countries of Europe have a very acute manpower problem. The powers proposed to be granted by the joint resolution would exist only during the remainder of this calendar year. All the powers proposed to be created by the joint resolution would expire on the 31st of December 1943.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator made the statement that it would be impossible to get laborers from Europe.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I did not make the statement that it would be impossible. I said that as a practical matter it would be very difficult if not impossible to get them out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I accept the correction. Has there not been quite a clamor for returning transports to bring persons from Europe to America?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not heard of any such clamor; but, so far as I am personally concerned, I shall be very happy to accept any amendment to the joint resolution which would prevent the importation of persons from Europe. I think it should be so worded that we would not be denied the opportunity of utilizing the labor of prisoners of war from Europe who might be brought into this country. In the hearings before the committee it was developed that the British were relying very largely on Italian prisoners of war in England at the present time for the production of farm crops, and that they had proved to be the most efficient laborers they could find. However, with the exception of prisoners of war, I should have no objection to an amendment to prohibit the importation of any person of European origin.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to ask a further question. With whom was the contract with respect to Mexican citizens entered into?

Mr. RUSSELL. The original contract was entered into in behalf of what might be called a commission, which consisted of representatives of the State Department and of the Department of Agriculture who signed on behalf of the American Government, and the Secretary of Labor, or the equivalent officer, of the Mexican Republic who signed on behalf of the Mexican Republic. The entire agreement is set forth in the House hearings.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator says that the contract provides for the return of those persons to Mexico.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But if another contract should be made there is nothing in the joint resolution which would provide for their return.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the joint resolution, but there is ample provision in the immigration laws. The moment they cease their duties here they are subject to deportation. The committee had before it the Assistant Director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, who stated that if any of them undertook to stay in this country the Immigration and Naturalization Service would endeavor to see that they were deported under the ordinary deportation procedure.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would it be possible under the terms of the joint resolution to import agricultural laborers from Puerto Rico?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would certainly be possible.

Mr. TAFT. That would be entirely possible, would it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Is there any plan to use the funds proposed to be appropriated for importing agricultural laborers from Puerto Rico?

Mr. RUSSELL. No such plan was brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. TAFT. We found from 100,000 to 150,000 men unemployed in Puerto Rico, many of whom, I am sure, would be physically capable of coming here. I wish to suggest that some effort be made to do something along that line. We were told that 15,000 Puerto Ricans actually signed up for mechanical work, and stated their willingness to put up $100 of their own money in each case to come to the United States, and that nothing had been done about it. Apparently no effort whatever has been made to recruit agricultural laborers from Puerto Rico, and it seems very strange to me that no such effort should be made when we there have a vast supply of American citizens who are out of work and who are capable of performing agricultural labor.

Mr. RUSSELL. No reason was assigned before the committee for not importing Puerto Ricans. However, it occurs to me that one reason might be that in ordinary times in this country we have a surplus of agricultural laborers. Only in a period of great emergency is there any dearth of farm labor in the United States. If labor is imported from the Bahamas or Mexico, we can force the laborers to return when the period of the emergency has passed. Puerto Ricans, being citizens of the United States, there is no way to compel them to return to Puerto Rico. That is the reason which occurs to me; but I do not know why Puerto Ricans have not been imported.

Mr. TAFT. I feel confident that they would be perfectly willing to return to Puerto Rico, and would desire to do so in most cases. Puerto Rico is somewhat farther away than the Bahamas, but it is no farther away than Jamaica; and I do not know of any reason why we should not avail ourselves of the supply of American citizens in Puerto Rico.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have the suggestion of the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. For the information of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], let me say that as a practical matter I think there is no chance for the importation of any agricultural workers from Europe. If he fears such a result, I must differ with him.

In California we would welcome any efficient farm operators, because otherwise we may be in a very desperate condition. I was informed that in the Azores there were several thousand very fine Portuguese who were very proficient in the dairy business as milkers and in taking care of herds. Our need for such dairy workers was so great that I immediately discussed with the State Department, the Army, and the Navy the possibility of securing workers from those islands, and I was informed by all the governmental agencies that there would be no chance of our bringing in

any agricultural workers from Europe or from Asia.

For more than a year I have been concerned over the problem of importing Mexican workers. In the West, at least, where we have had wide experience with workers from Mexico, and some from Puerto Rico, we have found that the Mexican workers are thoroughly acceptable to our people. They are congenial and are liked by our people. They do very fine agricultural work. On the other hand, it was the opinion of almost all our farm leaders that the Puerto Ricans would not be satisfactory, and that once they were brought into this country there would be very great difficulty in returning them.

Mr. RUSSELL. We could not return them unless they should desire to return.

Mr. DOWNEY. Every method is being employed to safeguard the return of the workers from Mexico when their services are no longer needed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to make a brief observation with reference to the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Of course, we are all sympathetic toward the effort to obtain agricultural laborers in the United States during the present critical times. We wish to obtain cotton pickers, vegetable pickers, and other farm workers. However, in justice to ourselves and in justice to the boys who are doing the fighting, our own citizens should have the opportunity of working on our farms. They should be given the opportunity to pick citrus fruits and vegetables in Florida, and cotton in the Southwest. I am most sympathetic toward the effort to obtain farm labor, but why neglect our own people? In Puerto Rico there are more than 250,000 unemployed. We complain because we have spent millions of dollars in Puerto Rico; but when there is an opportunity for Puerto Ricans to come here and work, we pay more attention to foreign groups than we do to our own citizens.

I think it is the duty of the Congress to insist that Puerto Rican citizens be given an opportunity to come into the continental United States. I know the excuse which is given. The Senator from Georgia was correct in his statement. There is a fear that the Puerto Ricans will not go back to Puerto Rico. Can any Senator stand on this floor and justify such an objection? I am sure the Puerto Ricans would go back of their own volition. But for groups of people in this country at a time we are fighting a war for democracy to say that we cannot allow our own citizens to come here and work because of a fear that they will not return to the place where they came from, is an untenable position to assume.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BONE. As I read the pending joint resolution rather hurriedly, I saw in it no discrimination against the importation of Puerto Ricans.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the measure which would prevent them from coming into the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, no; there is nothing in the joint resolution which would prevent that.

Mr. BONE. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; there is nothing of that character in the joint resolution. What I am complaining about is this: About 2 weeks ago I read in the newspaper that some Bahamans were being imported to the State of Florida. On instructions of the Senate committee was sent to Puerto Rico. During its investigation it found poverty, starvation; but many of the Puerto Ricans are good laborers. I inquired why there was a preference on the part of Florida, or any other State, for Bahaman rather than Puerto Rican labor. I inquired of officials of various departments as to what efforts were being made to utilize Puerto Rican labor in this country, and I found that some of the officials are just as scared as some Members of Congress apparently are. I was told that such a procedure would tend to reduce the wage standards of labor in this country. I do not think it would. Puerto Ricans also like to receive good wages, but they will work according to the circumstances at the time; they will work for the prevailing wage.

Mr. President, we talk about a Puerto Rican problem; it is an American problem. We created it. So I shall continue to insist that the departments of the Government, either under the pending joint resolution, or under the law as it now exists, give opportunity to Puerto Rican citizens. One of the generals on Guadalcanal was a Puerto Rican. His poor relatives in Puerto Rico—if he has any poor relatives, as I am sure he has—are not now being given an opportunity to work within the continental United States.

Mr. O'DANIEL and Mr. BONE addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if there is any provision in the pending measure which would prohibit those coming from foreign countries from accepting work other than that of an agricultural nature.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the pending measure which would prevent that, but as I recall in the contract between the United States and Mexico, there is contained language to the effect that Mexican nationals shall accept no employment other than agricultural employment.

Mr. O'DANIEL. There is nothing whatever in the proposed legislation which would restrict the employment of labor to the agricultural field?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing except the fact that if they do not engage in agricultural labor they are sent back to the country from whence they came.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Is that provided for in the pending measure?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it is not. It is not spelled out in the joint resolution, but it is in accordance with the terms of the contract, with Mexico, as I recall. At least it was testified before the committee that that is the method by which the situation had been handled up to then.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does it not appear to the Senator from Georgia that after arriving in the continental United States from other countries to engage in agricultural work, such persons might be tempted by higher wages afforded by industrial work and accept employment in those lines? If nothing prevented them from doing so it would not serve to help agriculture very much.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is something which would prevent them from doing so because if they should engage in other than agricultural labor they would be immediately deported. If they should undertake to engage in industrial labor they would be deported. If they should refuse to work on agricultural labor wherever it is available, they would be immediately deported.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If that is the situation, I should think it could be construed as a prohibition against them accepting other employment.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator asked me if it was spelled out in the measure, and I say that it is not, but it is in the agreements, or contracts, to which I have referred, and has been a part of the policy pursued up until the preset time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I was very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. I believe he has stated an issue, so far as I am concerned, with respect to the pending bill. I believe he stated he would welcome foreign labor to California. I wish to take the position fundamentally in this time of war, that I do not welcome foreign labor into this country. When young farmers of the country are fighting on foreign soil, and upon the high seas, I do not wish to see such a situation created in America, that the farms and industries of the country will be operated by men from other lands.

A short time ago the Senate passed the Bankhead bill for the deferment of farm labor. It is now in the other House, where it seems to have been slowed down. A chilling hand seems to have touched it. If that bill were passed and should become a law, I submit to the Senate that there would be no occasion for us to talk about importing foreign labor. I think it is very fundamental at this time, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] said a while ago, to think first of our own citizens and not to send them into the battle lines, and use men from other lands to fill their places of employment.

Mr. President, I make these comments in view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from West Virginia

that the Senator from California was expressing his own views and not expressing the views of the committee if he stated that he was in favor of importing foreign labor. I am sure the committee would be opposed to the importation of a considerable number of foreign farm laborers from Europe. There might be difficulties involved in returning such laborers to the land of their origin.

I want to say to the Senator, who referred to the young men in uniform, that all our hearts are with them, and the purpose of the pending measure is to furnish a sufficient supply of labor to insure that our men in uniform shall be fed. The total number of foreign laborers affected by this joint resolution is less than 6 percent of the total labor need and of those whom we hope to employ in order to assure that men at the front, as well as civilians at home, shall not suffer for the lack of food.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I have a request to make, if the Senator from Georgia can comply with it, and that is that he insert in the RECORD as a part of this debate a copy of the Mexican contract which has been referred to and which I presume is typical of the average contract under this sort of operation.

May I ask also at this point if men have been brought into the United States and are working under that contract, and if so, what is the authority for the execution of the contract?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very frank to say that I do not believe there is any specific statutory authority for the execution of the contract. There may be, but the contract was entered into, nevertheless, by the Department of Agriculture with the Government of Mexico.

Mr. BONE. Are Mexicans now permitted freely to enter this country?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; they are not permitted freely to enter the country, but if anyone thinks that the country will be overrun with Mexicans he is deceiving himself. The fact is that the Mexican Government does not want its nationals to come into this country. They have a border patrol. The committee had evidence to show that at that time Mexicans were rushing to the border in large numbers and were endeavoring to get into this country, but the Mexican Government stopped them at the border and sent them back to their homes, refusing to let them come in. The trouble has been to get a sufficient number of Mexicans to labor on our farms, not that we have been swamped with Mexicans. We have had difficulty in getting a sufficient number to take care of the long staple cotton in Arizona and New Mexico and to save the vegetable crop in California. We are not being swamped with Mexican labor, but the Department has been trying to get a sufficient number to take care of the present farm-labor problem.

Mr. BONE. I fear the Senator misunderstood the purport of my question. I understood the statement made on the floor was to the effect that there was no quota in operation as affecting Mexico, and I was merely inquiring about the status of the Mexican who attempted to immigrate to this country, and I was wondering, if there is no quota system, what arrangement exists between the two governments?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Arizona is present, and I ask him to clear up that question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, no alien can come from any country in the Western Hemisphere unless he has a passport visaed by an American consul, and to obtain such a visa he must pass an educational test; he must show that if he comes to the United States he will not become a public charge, and he must show that he is in good health.

Mr. BONE. Are those the only restrictions? If there is no quota, suppose a million men from Guatemala or Honduras or Mexico desired to come into the United States, and met the qualifications, could the 1,000,000 come under this arrangement?

Mr. HAYDEN. They could come just as a million Canadians could come.

Mr. BONE. I am merely seeking information, I am not making an argument; but I should like to know if that is the case?

Mr. RUSSELL. They could not come in under this arrangement, they could come under existing law. This measure would not increase the number.

Mr. HAYDEN. The quota applies to European immigration only; it limits the number that may come from Germany, France, Spain, and other European countries in proportion to the number of people of the particular race who are in this country. There is an absolute prohibition of oriental immigration. It does not, however, apply to the Western Hemisphere, to anyone from Mexico or South America, for instance, so that such immigration is actually regulated by the visa system. We protect our country by providing that no one can come in from Canada, from Mexico, from Guatemala, from Brazil, or any other country unless he can satisfy our immigration standards. He has got to pass a literacy test, show that he will not become a public charge, and that he is not suffering from any disease. When we have had difficult times in this country it has been practically impossible for any farmer to obtain such labor, and the practical effect of this measure will be to relieve, to some extent, that situation.

Mr. BONE. I raised the question merely in order to clarify this immigration picture. I am frank to say that I did not realize that the barriers were down to quite the extent which has been suggested, and that the only restriction was one the individual may find imposed on himself by lack of financial responsibility and education. Assuming that there is financial responsibility and education in the individual himself, and he could secure the visa from a diplomatic representative of this Government in the countries whence he desires to come, he would have no trouble in getting into the United States, would he?

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that it is not quite so easy as it sounds, for, as a matter of present practice, these countries will not let their nationals come into the United States. They endeavor to restrain them in every way they can. They have border patrols, and the agreement with Mexico makes it plain Mexico does not want any great number of her citizens to come to the United States, for fear it will disturb the economy of the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly respond to a few inquiries I should like to make?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to undertake to do so.

Mr. DANAHER. I think the Senator can do so. I invite the Senator's attention to section 2 on page 6. I understand from that section that the payments are to be made to the States in a sum not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000 and that the sums so apportioned are to be available for expenditure by the Agricultural Extension Service of the States. Let me ask the Senator first, please, whether or not the agricultural extension services referred to are State services or Federal services at the present time?

Mr. RUSSELL. The reference is to State services, because there is no such thing as a field service for the Federal Extension Service.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, inviting the Senator's attention to lines 20 to 22, inclusive, it follows, does it not, that the Agricultural Extension Service at the present time, the State services within the States, are to be subjected to supervision and approval by the Administrator, at least, in respect of the sum to be apportioned to the States?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true at the present time. The Senator is well aware that under the Morreel Act, under the Smith-Lever Act, and all other extension appropriations an allocation is made on a formula provided by Congress, and none of the funds is to be paid until an arrangement satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture shall have been entered into between the Federal Government and the State agencies. This is merely a continuation of that. The Secretary of Agriculture now has the right to withhold Federal funds from any State unless the State extension service submits an agreement for the expenditure of the funds in a way satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture. This does not give to the Agriculture Department any new power over the State extension services.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Insofar as we would authorize the recruitment and placement and training of workers, we would not authorize the taking of any worker against his consent; would we?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing on earth in the joint resolution that requires any involuntary labor of any kind.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, will the Senator turn to page 10, lines 18 to 24, where we find the proviso stated in the limitation set forth. The proviso says that should the county extension agent refuse

to give his consent in any case to the removal of a worker from County A to County B, let us say—I now quote:

Any interested or affected person may appeal to the Administrator, and the Administrator may permit the expenditure of such funds for the transportation of such worker from such county if the Administrator finds that the services of such worker can be more effectively utilized at another place of employment.

First, let me ask the Senator, who is the interested or affected person who may appeal to the Administrator?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was afraid someone was going to ask that question. In my opinion, that would give an appeal to the man who wished to employ the laborer, the laborer himself, the laborer's wife, or the laborer's child, or any representative of the United States Government who is engaged in the recruitment and placement of these laborers. That is my construction of it.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator another question: Is there any control over any such agricultural worker by the United States Employment Service?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not sure I understand the Senator's question.

Mr. DANAHER. Under the system of job priority being set up in the United States Employment Service, no worker may work except in a given industry until and unless he has a certain type of certificate from the United States Employment Service. I, therefore, ask whether or not the United States Employment Service in any respect known to the Senator will have jurisdiction in any way over these agricultural workers?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is contemplated that the United States Employment Service will be utilized to locate the workers and to notify the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution, as well as the county agents, as to where the labor is located; but unless the United States Employment Service is given direct authority over these laborers, I do not know any power they would have at all.

Mr. DANAHER. Would not the United States Employment Service or its representatives be such an "interested or affected person" as to be able to move a man from County A and County B?

Mr. RUSSELL. They would have an appeal to the Administrator, undoubtedly.

Mr. DANAHER. Conversely, they would have the power to deny unemployment certificates within the county in which Mr. A is a resident unless he consented to go to County B.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is true, but I do not think this measure impinges on the authority of the employment service in the slightest degree.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator, under the language on page 9, lines 15 to 24, and following, is it the Senator's understanding that this measure will supplement or supersede in any respect the work of the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very frank to say that I think this joint resolution transfers all the power for the transportation interstate of migratory farm labor from the Farm Security Administration to the Administrator of Food Distribution and Production. However, there is nothing in the measure that prohibits the Administrator from utilizing the facilities of the Farm Security Administration. It is contemplated that, so far as existing camps are concerned, that he will utilize the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator's answer coincides exactly with my own understanding, and I wish to thank him.

Calling his attention to page 12, beginning in line 14, there is reference to the Farm Security Administration, and I assume that the reference deals with recoupment by that agency for the use of facilities which now are chargeable to the Farm Security account. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The purpose of subdivision (d) on page 12 is to provide for covering into the Treasury any funds received for the account of any of the farm placement centers, including the camps which are under the operation of the Farm Security Administration. Heretofore, the Farm Security Administration has collected a certain amount from people who were in the migratory labor camps, which has been placed in a revolving fund. This measure provides that all such receipts, whether from the Farm Security Administration, or the Federal Extension Service, or any other agency, shall be covered into the Treasury.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I understand that there is a limitation of some 2 percent on the total fund appropriated for administrative expenses.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Is that 2 percent limited to the difference between $20,000,000 and $40,000,000, or is it on the entire appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. It applies to the entire $40,000,000.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. McNARY addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to ask the Senator to clarify section 4. I call the attention of the Senators from Montana, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Arizona, where sugar beets are raised, to this particular section. We in the Northwest rely on migratory labor, we have migratory laborers coming into our section by the hundreds of thousands. Employment of such labor is the only way by which we can possibly harvest our crops, as I think the Senators from the Northwest who are present will agree.

In section 4 we find the following language:

No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, if such worker has resided in such county for a period of 1 year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period.

I can easily envisage a situation in which thousands of folks in one of the States of the South would be through picking cotton. During the preceding year they had moved North. They move with the seasons. Am I to understand that before such workers could come to the Northwest to help us with our threshing and our harvesting every one of them, some of whom cannot read or write, some of whom do not know their rights, would have to go to a county agent? Would they have to go to a county agent and get permission to come, for example, from the State of Georgia to the State of North Dakota, or the State of Montana, or the State of Idaho?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not understand the measure has that effect at all. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would impose the slightest restraint on labor. Any private contractor from the Senator's State could go into any other State of the Union, whether it be Georgia, Wyoming, Washington, or any other State, recruit all the labor he pleased, and move them wherever he pleased, and no one would have to sign, and no one would have to approve. This provision is to prevent the use of Federal funds to impose upon the very class of labor to which the Senator refers, as well as to keep an equalized supply of labor in the country.

A number of instances were brought to the attention of the subcommittee, and doubtless to the attention of the other House, instances of the United States Employment Service and other agencies of the Government using some outrageous methods in forcing laborers to move from one section of the country to another by intimidation and threats.

If the Senator will turn to the hearings, he will find there one very significant letter. The United States Employment Service sent out this letter to a large number of farm laborers and farm tenants:

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE,
Rome, Ga.

Your selective-service occupational questionnaire shows you have a farm background. Please see Mr. Ernest Farmer in the United States Employment Service Office at 522 Broad Street, Rome, Ga., by Monday, January 25, 1943.

M. A. N. PATTON,
Manager.

There is evidence in the RECORD that when some farm tenants and sharecroppers who were under contract, and did not wish to leave their contracts, who were satisfied with their housing conditions, who were satisfied with their contractual relations with their landlords, presented themselves to the United States employment officer, he told them that they had registered as farmers, and

that they would either go to Florida to gather vegetables or would be inducted immediately into the Army.

There is an instance of a responsible citizen writing in to his Representative in Congress to ascertain whether the United States Employment Service had the power to put a man in the Army if he did not leave his farm and go to Florida to gather vegetables. There should be a brake somewhere to prevent that kind of thing occurring. Therefore we provide that before any such practice as that can be carried on, the county extension agent has to approve the man leaving.

There were other illustrations, such as that of the authorities going into one county and, by intensive recruitment, moving as much as 50 or 60 percent of the local labor in the county, and such as that of people in one county going over to another county and engaging in competitive bidding for labor, so that the crops in one area would fail absolutely for lack of gathering, because all the labor had been drawn off to crops that could afford to pay a slightly higher wage.

Section 4 is an effort to stabilize the use of labor so that it will be employed most effectively. Any person affected by it can write a letter to Mr. Davis, if he feels he is entitled to transportation at Government expense, and Mr. Davis has a right to say, "You have a right to go at Government expense"; but no person can restrain him.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I believe an impartial reading of section 4 will indicate that, taking an extreme case, although there might be four or five thousand workers who were not at all needed in a given county farther south, the county agent, by refusing to sign up and permit them to go north, could freeze them in that county. Is not that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not true at all, as I see it. The Senator may construe it in that way, but I do not so construe it, because the Administrator has absolute power in the matter. If the Senator will read the succeeding section, he will find that the Administrator has absolute power to nullify anything the county agent might do.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia permit me to make an observation in reply to the question of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. OVERTON. The situation to which the Senator from North Dakota refers is not at all affected by the pending measure. Any laborer may move from any county to any other county, or from any State to another State, at his own will. There is no effort on the part of Congress, through the enactment of the pending measure, to produce a situation of involuntary servitude, because constitutionally we could not do it. We are merely creating a new agency to help in the present labor situation, and we are supplying the agency with funds. So far as the funds of the Government are concerned, they may be employed solely under the restrictions set forth in section 4.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia permit me to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator to do so.

Mr. LANGER. Assume that a large farmer in the State of Montana wishes to hire 500 men who are in Georgia. How would he proceed, under section 4?

Mr. OVERTON. He could go to Georgia and get the 500 men, if they wished to go, but he could not take advantage of the funds appropriated by the pending measure to transport them.

Mr. LANGER. If Congress is to appropriate $40,000,000, why should not the farmers in Montana or North Dakota or Wyoming have the benefit of that fund?

Mr. OVERTON. Because, on the other hand, Government funds can be used to deplete a county or a State of labor which the county or the State absolutely needs. Why should the Government funds be used for that purpose?

Mr. LANGER. There may be an excess amount of labor in a county, and the laboring men may want to go north to work but do not have the funds necessary to make the move.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe there is a county agent in the United States, whether it be in Georgia or North Dakota, who, if there were 4,000 or 5,000 surplus laborers in his county, would interpose objection to their being moved. If there were 4,000 or 5,000 surplus laborers and he would not permit them to move, he would not keep his job very long.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Georgia will agree with me that under section 4 the county agent has the power to block the movement of labor?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; he does not have such power.

Mr. LANGER. A man affected may appeal, of course.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. It is so simple that a man can write a letter, and it will be considered to be an appeal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN NUYS in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator from North Dakota has raised this question. It was raised in the committee. Perhaps it may be well to call attention to the language of the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad if the Senator will do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If Senators will turn to page 4 of the bill, beginning in line 7, they will find the language which was written in on the floor of the House dealing with this subject matter. It reads:

Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, or for the transportation of any worker outside the limits of the State where he resides or is working without the prior consent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture for such State or other official who performs similar functions for such State.

It was perfectly obvious upon the reading of that language that Congress was providing a large appropriation to make migratory labor accessible and available to agricultural employers throughout the United States. But at the same time it was saying, "This purpose, this objective of Congress, may be defeated utterly and completely by any county agent in a county in which there is a surplus supply, or by any agricultural commissioner in any county where there is a surplus supply, upon his own motion, in his own discretion, for reasons which are satisfactory to him, and without giving any reason to anyone at all."

The criticism in the committee, I think, was practically universal that no such broad power should be delegated by Congress in making a labor appropriation to county and State officials.

As one member of the committee, I sought to have the whole matter stricken. The committee took the other view and adopted the language to which attention has now been directed by the Senator from North Dakota.

To me the language is still open to objection. The argument which the Senator from Georgia has made is, to my mind, no argument at all. He quotes from a communication which was written by a citizen of Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; by an employee of the United States Employment Service who was sent to Georgia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. He is quite right. But the incident, I think, happened there.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The situation which is there described is simply this: An employee of the United States Employment Service exercised or attempted to exercise a power he did not possess. He had no right to say to any worker, "You go to Florida or else you will go into the Army." It was altogether outside his jurisdiction. And now, because, forsooth, an employee of the United States Employment Service in a State somewhere is willing to attempt to exercise power he does not possess, and to compel workers to go where he wants them to go or else go into the Army, we are asked to say in a law that the county agent shall have such power. We are now proposing to say in connection with an appropriation designed to provide labor for all agricultural employers throughout the United States that a county agent may veto the act of Congress.

The power was taken away from the State agricultural commissioner in this provision which the committee has adopted. And then this provision, to which the Senator from Georgia draws attention, was written:

Provided, That upon the refusal of the county extension agent to give his consent in any such case, any interested or affected person may appeal to the Administrator, and the Administrator may permit the expendi-

ture of such funds for the transportation of such worker from such county if the Administrator finds that the services of such worker can be more effectively utilized at another place of employment.

In fairness to the committee and to the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who has had a particularly onerous task in working out this bill, I may say that the purpose of that language was to prevent the sort of thing which I criticized in the committee and which I have criticized on the floor. My thought is that it will not be effective, because the migratory workers for whom we are trying to provide employment in this bill are persons who are not likely to make such an appeal. We are creating an obstruction. My feeling was, in the committee, and still is, that this provision ought to be stricken from the bill. In that event, when the matter goes to conference the conferees will have a perfectly free hand in writing a provision. They cannot write a more liberal provision than that which is contained in this section.

My feeling is that even though we are appropriating money, and that this provision applies only to those who derive the benefit of the money, and does not in any way prevent a worker traveling on his own funds or on the funds of someone else, it is nevertheless a restriction upon the free movement of labor, which should not be written into a law of Congress at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this provision is not intended as any restriction on the movement of labor anywhere. Its purpose is to prevent the expenditure of Federal funds to dislocate the supply of labor and to hire labor from counties or from areas where the labor is needed.

To hear the distinguished Senators speak one would think that Congress was undertaking to pass a law which would forbid a farm laborer leaving the county of his residence. Nothing could be further from the truth. The bill does not undertake in any wise to place any restrictions whatever on any farm laborer anywhere in the United States. It merely says that these funds shall not be used to drain off labor from one county or one section where it is needed, for the benefit of another county or of another section. It will operate between counties as well as between the State of Georgia and the State of Wyoming, as illustrated by the Senator from Wyoming.

Senators talk about the measure interfering with the movement of migratory labor. This provision does not affect migratory labor. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] overlooks the language which provides that if the worker has not resided in the county for a period of 1 year, and been engaged in agriculture during that year, there is no restriction whatever upon his movements. It does not affect the migratory laborer in the ordinary sense of the word who moves from one crop to another crop, and from one State to another State, because unless the man has been living in the county for the full period of a year and been engaged in agriculture during that year the funds may be expended to remove him from that county.

The whole theory of the joint resolution, let me say very frankly, is to give the largest possible measure of control to the States and to the State agencies. The joint resolution decentralizes the program. As to whether or not it will work, I do not know.

The joint resolution as it came to the House from the Budget Bureau vested all the power in the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution. As the measure came to the Senate from the House, it undertook to put all the authority in the county extension agents and in the Federal Employment Service.

We have revised the joint resolution so as to give the county agents absolute control of the local recruitment of labor, with the Federal agency to have the power to move labor into a State and to handle such farm labor as might be imported.

There is nothing in the joint resolution which is inconsistent with the whole theory of doing such work or of handling such labor. Certainly, no agency should reach into Georgia or Wyoming or any other State at the behest of anyone in Georgia or Wyoming or any other State and interfere with contractual arrangements already entered into between farmers and laborers, and use Federal funds to lure laborers away by offering higher wages for Federal employment. Nothing in the joint resolution is consistent with any aspect of peonage. The whole theory of the measure is that the county extension agent knows more about the farm labor within his county than does anyone else, and that he should have some control over all parts of the program as it applies to his county.

It might be said that we are wrecking the program because we require the Administrator, whether he wishes to do so or not, to allocate at least $13,500,000 to the county agents and the State extension services. It might be said that under section 2 of the joint resolution there might be a program which would result in recruiting laborers from one county, and then having someone go into another county and offer the workers in that county a little more money, and move them out, under Federal funds, although it is true that in the joint resolution funds are provided for moving laborers into some county or counties.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that it has always been my understanding that the agricultural extension services and agricultural county agents of a State carry on work which is primarily educational. I am wondering why it is that the committee has written into the joint resolution a mandatory provision, as appears on page 6, that the Administrator shall apportion a specific amount to the State extension services for the purpose of handling transient labor. As the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia stated a while ago, the entire program is under the supervision of the Administrator; and, as I further understood the Senator to say, the Administrator is to be permitted to select any agency he desires in order to carry on the work. Should that be the case, why make it mandatory that the Administrator must employ the State agricultural extension services in order to carry on the work?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may say that in the subcommittee I held exactly the same view as that which the Senator from Louisiana has expressed, but I happened to be the only member of the subcommittee to entertain that view.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. As soon as I finish discussing this point I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

The evidence showed that the State extension services had already set up their programs, and already had people out mobilizing the high-school boys and girls and undertaking to locate in the small towns laborers with a farm background. Therefore, an overwhelming majority of the committee felt that, insofar as the mobilization and placement of farm labor within the counties and within the States was concerned, it should be made mandatory that the Administrator should utilize the services of the county agents and of the State extension services.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose the Administrator were to find that that plan does not work. Would he not run short of funds? In other words, he could not use the money for any other purpose, could he?

It strikes me that the joint resolution should be amended so as not to make it obligatory on the Administrator to spend not less than $13,500,000 or more than $20,000,000 in that way.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I must say that, although in the committee I agreed with the Senator's view, I do not think he has correctly interpreted the language. The joint resolution requires that the Administrator shall apportion the money, but he is not required to spend it. The requirement is that he shall apportion at least $13,500,000 of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. If he did not apportion it, he could not use it for any other purpose; is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, he could not.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I had in mind. The joint resolution is specific in that respect; on page 6, line 15, provision is made that—

The Administrator shall apportion among the several States, on the basis of need, not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I agree with the statement the Senator has just made. But a few minutes ago the Senator stated that the Administrator would have to spend the money through the State extension services. I was pointing out that he would not have to spend it. He would not have to spend it at all. He must apportion it to them; but if he were not satisfied with the administration of it, he would not have to pay it to the extension services. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would force the Administrator to pay the money to the State extension services.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there any language in the resolution which would

enable the Administrator to utilize the facilities of the United States Employment Service?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. It is contemplated that the United States Employment Service will take quite a large part in the program. For example, the State of New York has already passed a State law under which the United States Employment Service and the county agents and representatives of various farm groups have set up a committee which will receive some of the funds.

The Senator will see that local areas are to be permitted to enter into agreements with any private or public agency to perform any part of the work; and it is contemplated that the United States Employment Service will receive a certain amount of the funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us assume that a certain amount of money is apportioned to the State of Maine. Could any of the money be used to transport laborers from Maine into New Hampshire?

Mr. RUSSELL. It could be; yes. However, a State extension service is not going to do anything like that, of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. On page 7, line 2, I notice that the extension service can pay, among other things, for the—

transportation, supervision, subsistence, protection, health, and medical and burial services, and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary personal property.

That language does not indicate that the labor must be within their own States; the funds could be used to send labor outside of their jurisdiction or vice versa. There is no limitation as to what can be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should simply like to remark that I cannot imagine any State director of extension spending his money to ship his labor outside of his State, to some other State. He might do it, but I cannot imagine it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not attempting to argue that point. I am trying to find out how the money may be spent. During this emergency I can imagine many cases where the extension service of one State would find it advantageous to enter into an agreement with the extension service of another State to exchange labor services in saving the crops of their respective States. All crops do not mature at the same time. I desired to make it certain that it was the intention of Congress to permit the use of the funds to transport labor out as well as in a State. Under the measure as now written the funds could be used in such a manner, could they not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; if there were such a revolution in the ordinary processes of human nature, he could do it, but I do not think any one other than a person in some institution would be likely to do such a thing.

It is contemplated that a State extension service director could bring persons from some other State into his State. Of course, we give the State extension service director of any given State every power that we give to the directors of State extension services of other States. They all have the same power.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us suppose that the State director for Maine desired to have some labor come from Massachusetts to Maine. Under the measure as now written, could he pay all the expenses incidental to bringing that labor from Massachusetts to Maine?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; he could do so, as far as transportation and subsistence expenses were concerned. He could pay all the expenses of bringing the labor from Massachusetts into his State; and it is contemplated that the directors will do so.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will pardon me, I promised first to yield to the Senator from Arizona, and then will yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to comment on the issue raised by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. The matter of the difficulty of bringing in labor was pointed out. I should like to make the point that the difficulty has been, not that the Department of Agriculture or the Manpower Commission have been too ready to admit laborers from other countries, they have not been quick enough to admit them.

I desire to call the attention of the Senator from West Virginia to the fact that my State responded to the request of the Secretary of Agriculture to plant American-Egyptian cotton or long-staple cotton. At the request of the Department, my State increased the acreage of long-staple cotton from 65,000 acres in 1940 to 127,000 acres in 1942. There was an implied promise that aid would be given by the Government to pick that long-staple cotton. There was an implied promise that aid would be given to the people of California and other States to help them when they responded to the request of the Department of Agriculture to plant the crops which are needed in the war program.

I submit, Mr. President, that long-staple cotton is needed in the war program today, and needed badly. Because we responded to the appeal which was made, there was a shortage of workers in Arizona. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and I went to Arizona and California and conducted a hearing in the month of November last year. We found that the people of the State of Arizona and the people of the State of California were desperate in their attempt to get laborers to harvest their crops and pick the long-staple cotton needed by the War Department.

That is the situation which we found, not only in regard to long-staple cotton, but in regard to the dairy and other products of our State. Dairymen were compelled to sell cows for beef purposes because they could not get laborers. They could not get laborers to save their feed. That was the general situation, without going into detail, which we found in the State of Arizona and in the State of California. There was a general farm-labor shortage.

About the first of March of this year I went back to the State of Arizona to find out just what had happened to that program. In March, which is the planting season for long-staple cotton, I saw with my own eyes, fields where not a lock of the previous crop had been picked. The ground was as white as the stalks. That cotton is needed in the war program.

In the month of October I had called upon the Manpower Commission and the United States Employment Agency and asked about the importation of Mexican labor to pick the long-staple cotton. They responded that we had plenty of domestic labor. They were going to import labor from other States to pick the cotton, but it was not done. I asked, "Where is the labor about which you are talking?" The answer which I finally received was that some professor in Oklahoma had testified that on October 1 there would be 100,000 workers available to send to the western area; but on October 1 they did not come, and they never came.

Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that if there is a surplus of farm labor in West Virginia or in any other State, we will welcome it with open arms in Arizona. I hope that he will not vote against this bill and thereby prevent the Government of the United States from getting long-staple cotton picked after it has been planted, because it is proposed to import labor from another country.

Mr. President, this is a serious problem. The farmer is facing a serious manpower shortage, and has faced it throughout the past year. The people of my State have suffered. We hear much talk about how much money the farmers are making. Some of them have made money; but I can point to farmers in the State of Arizona who have lost money in the year 1942.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think I still have the floor. I am glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What has become of the farm labor in the Senator's State which makes it necessary to import so much farm labor?

Mr. McFARLAND. I will gladly answer that question. In the first place, our farm laborers have responded to the call of their country and have gone into the military service. In the second place, they have responded to the call of industry. They have gone to work in the construction of large training bases, Japanese relocation camps, and war industries. We cannot get them back, because they are making more money elsewhere. They responded because they were offered more money elsewhere.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What will become of the laborers whom it is proposed to import?

Mr. McFARLAND. The machinery proposed to be established by the joint resolution would keep them there as long as their services were needed. As I understand, if we go to the expense of importing them, they will be kept there until their job is finished, or for the length of time they agree to stay.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] asked why it is proposed to

give this job to the Extension Service. One of the reasons is the dissatisfaction with the Farm Security Administration. They did not get the desired results last year. That is stating it frankly and honestly. The farmers lost money because those agencies did not do the job. While some good was accomplished, they did not handle the situation satisfactorily to the farmers.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate the kind consideration of the able Senator in charge of the joint resolution. I have not had much time to study the Senate committee amendment to the measure as it passed the House, but it occurs to me that complete control of the funds and the program would be placed in the hands of the Food Administrator, who is Mr. Davis. To that extent I assume it would be taken away from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture, or the remaining part of the Department which he controls. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is my understanding. The Executive order of March 26, 1943, confers on Mr. Davis all the powers which the Secretary of Agriculture has heretofore had in dealing with this problem. It also places under his direct supervision the operations of certain bureaus in the Department, including the Extension Service.

Mr. McNARY. Under the Executive order, the Extension Service goes to Mr. Davis.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. It is no longer under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Executive order undoubtedly transfers from the Secretary of Agriculture the powers which he has heretofore exercised over the Federal Extension Service.

Mr. McNARY. Is it not the opinion of the very able Senator that the amendment which has been proposed by the Senate committee would centralize the power in the Administrator, as against the House version, which would lodge the authority largely in the extension service in the States?

Mr. RUSSELL. Very frankly, that is what the committee undertook to do.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I thought. A few moments ago distinguished Senators thought that this was a decentralization measure. I think the effect of it would be a high degree of centralization.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was referring to the operations of the Administrator within the States. I invite the attention of the Senator to section 2. The able Senator has undoubtedly read it. No Senator has a quicker grasp of legislation than has the Senator from Oregon. He will see that the State extension service would have almost unlimited control over the funds allocated to the States for the recruitment and placement of labor within the States.

Mr. McNARY. I recall the work which was done in the States last year. Parenthetically, let me say that I favor State supervision, whenever possible, as opposed to Federal supervision. The Extension Service, in cooperation with the United States Employment Service, worked very satisfactorily, and this year a great many of the States favored the joint cooperative effort of those two agencies rather than a centralization in the office of the Food Administrator. Did the committee give thought and consideration to that question?

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee did; and the committee sought to effectuate that very idea in section 2. The committee so worded the amendment that $20,000,000 of this money, if spent at all, must be spent through the State extension services and such agencies as they desire to enlist to assist them.

Mr. McNARY. "Such agencies", which omits specifically the Federal agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; if the Senator will read the language——

Mr. McNARY. I am not as familiar with the language as is the able Senator; but is it not true that it is proposed to work entirely with the extension services in the States through the Food Administrator, omitting, so far as possible, the activities and cooperation of the United States Employment Service?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. The hearings on the bill, which were exceedingly interesting, showed that the several States had different systems. The State of New York, for example, was represented before the committee. The State extension director appeared and outlined in some detail the plan which had been adopted in the State of New York for cooperation between the State extension forces and the United States Employment Service. It is contemplated that the State extension services will work in the closest harmony with the United States Employment Service. They are given power, as the Senator will see on line 14, page 7 of the joint resolution. The following language appears:

> Such extension services may enter into agreements with other public and private agencies and individuals and utilize the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals in carrying out the purposes of this section.

So far as it was brought to the attention of the committee—and we heard, directly or indirectly, from nearly all the State extension services—I believe that without exception they plan to work in close harmony with the United States Employment Service.

Mr. McNARY. If the joint resolution should become an act, I hope that may prove to be the fact.

I observe that the increase is from $26,000,000 to $40,000,000. Will the Senator tell me why the Senate committee saw fit to alter and modify in many respects the House provisions by the insertion of the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will be frank and say to the Senator from Oregon that some of the members of the committee, including the Senator from Georgia, had a great deal of difficulty in determining exactly what the joint resolution, as passed by the House, meant.

Mr. McNARY. Did the Senator experience that difficulty with respect to the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, as the Senator well knows, anyone who has any connection with the writing of a law knows what he has in mind, and he thinks it is covered by his bill, whether it is written into the bill or not. The Senator is aware of that. Apparently the author of the House joint resolution knew exactly what it was designed to do. But from my reading of it, it appeared there was considerable conflict in its language. There were a number of limitations, such as that read by the Senator from Wyoming, whereby the commissioner of agriculture in any State would have the right to forbid the movement of any labor without a State. There was language which provided that in this interstate movement of labor the Extension Service should work with the United States Employment Service, and it said that this work should be done under general rules and regulations to be issued by the Federal office of the Extension Service of the United States Employment Service.

It occurred to me that while one bureau in the Department of Labor had just as much authority to write rules and regulations as a bureau in the Department of Agriculture, they might have some difficulty in ever agreeing on rules and regulations for the interstate movement of labor.

There were a number of other provisions in the joint resolution as passed by the House which were just as confusing to me, because I thought that someone somewhere should have final authority. It is said that the United States Extension Service and the United States Employment Service should write rules and regulations, without saying who should have the right to reconcile any differences between the agencies. My observation convinces me that under such circumstances we would not be likely to have any rules and regulations.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator knows my profound objection to an appropriation bill containing a legislative provision. The objection is as acute in this instance as when legislative amendments are proposed to regular annual current appropriation bills. I believe this is in violation of the rules of the Senate, to the extent that it is an attempt to write legislation into an appropriation bill, though not one of the annual appropriation bills. Of course, I am not going to raise the point, but, as the Senator knows, it is a practice which I deplore most profoundly.

I merely wish to add this inquiry at this time: How many witnesses appeared before the committee, and how general were the hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. The hearings were very extensive. They embraced 283 printed pages. We had before us representatives of all the farm organizations, including some I had never before heard of. Of course, the committee was a deficiency subcommittee, as the Senator is aware. We had farm organizations which appeared before the committee who never found their way before the committee on agricultural appropriations.

There appeared before the committee the newly appointed Administrator, and the directors of the extension services of four or five States. We had before us the Secretary of Agriculture, in addition to a representative of the Federal Farm Bureau Federation, the Grange, and other farm organizations, as well as individuals who represented States and groups. We had a very wide variety of witnesses. In fact, it was one of the most thorough hearings I have seen.

Mr. McNARY. Did the farm organizations to which the Senator has referred approve of the Senate committee's amendment, or did they not express their preference for the House provisions?

Mr. RUSSELL. We may as well be frank about it——

Mr. McNARY. We always are.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Farm Bureau Federation endorsed the House joint resolution as written. When some of the complications of the House joint resolution were pointed out to them, they came in with a great many separate amendments which they proposed to the measure as it passed the House. The committee then undertook to write a complete substitute. Mr. Goss, of the Grange, and representatives of other farm organizations, expressed some doubts as to the workability of the House joint resolution.

I will say to the Senator from Oregon that as far as the farm organizations are concerned, and particularly the Farm Bureau Federation, the pending joint resolution embraces more of their ideas than mine, because I opposed very vigorously some of my colleagues on the committee who supported the views of the Farm Bureau, and I lost in committee. I would say, therefore, it is more of a Farm Bureau measure than anything else. Some of the members of the subcommittee were very anxious to have the ideas of the Farm Bureau written into the joint resolution.

Mr. McNARY. Did the committee have before it a representative of the United States Employment Service?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I do not think there was a representative of the United States Employment Service before the committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I hesitate to be provincial at any time, but in this instance I may state that I think this work was carried on splendidly in my own State last year under the United States Employment Service, and I was rather hopeful that the same service would be rendered this year, and continued under the same administration. I was curious to know if the committee requested a representative of this very reputable and competent Service to come before it and have him express the views of the Service.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I did not invite them.

Mr. McNARY. The pending joint resolution is really the Food Administrator's measure, with the Extension Service assigned to him to administer it, and somewhat sanctioned by the farm organizations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that it certainly is not a measure of the Food Administrator. The Food Administrator wrote a letter to the committee very vigorously protesting against several provisions in the joint resolution, and earnestly insisting that they be stricken from the measure. I am not certain whether he approves any substantial part of the joint resolution or not, but the Senator has stated that it is his measure. To make his position clear, he wrote me a letter which very vigorously protested against a number of provisions in the joint resolution and earnestly urged the committee to strike them out, or change several of the provisions.

Mr. McNARY. Was the joint resolution reported unanimously from the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. No opposition to the joint resolution was expressed in the committee. As I recall, the junior Senator from Massachusetts—though he is in the Chamber and can make his own statement—stated that he had no desire to oppose reporting the joint resolution, but he reserved the right to oppose any portion of it when it got to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Maine also indicated his opposition to some features of the measure, as I did.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I recall, the Senator from Maine was opposed to the idea of legislating and appropriating in the same bill. He expressed the same dissent to that expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not like the idea of legislating in the Appropriations Committee; but what was the committee to do? A measure came to the Senate from the House of Representatives; it contained legislative provisions and appropriations, and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and we were compelled to handle it. There is nothing new in such procedure. Year after year we have taken up bills containing provisions which are legislative, and also appropriation items to carry on the agencies of the Government. There never has been any basic legislation affecting the N. Y. A. before any standing committee of the Senate. It has always been handled on a year-to-year basis by the Committee on Appropriations. For the W. P. A., which was in existence for some years, there never was any basic act, and no standing committee of the Senate ever saw a bill relating to the powers and functions of the W. P. A. It was handled on a year-to-year basis by the Appropriations Committee. While I think it is much better to have a legislative provision providing for appropriations rather than to write a bill and the appropriation all in the same measure, certainly the committee could not refuse to have anything to do with this very important problem of attempting to supplement the decreasing farm labor in this country, merely to take the time to decide what committee should have handled the bill and how it should have been handled. It came to us from the House of Representatives, and we have done the best we could with it, both in respect to the legislative and appropriation features.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I feel that it may be appropriate to say that in my service on the Appropriations Committee I do not remember an occasion when more full and complete study was given to a proposal than was given to this measure. I think the Senator from Georgia should be complimented on the manner in which he conducted the hearings and the executive sessions of the committee at which the text of the joint resolution was discussed. The problem presented to us was, without question, one of the most difficult which has been presented to the Appropriations Committee for some time. We had this great national need for agricultural labor; we had a joint resolution which came to the Senate from the House, written partly upon the floor and partly in the committee, which raised many questions of emotional disagreement as well as a factual disagreement. The Senator from Georgia was instrumental in having legislative draftsmen present. When the Food Administrator was appointed the committee adjourned in order to give him an opportunity to come to Washington to present his point of view to the committee. After that was done, the Food Administrator was asked to suggest to the committee language which he felt might serve the purpose for which the Food administrator had been selected. He did that, and, as the Senator from Georgia has said, that suggestion was not accepted by the subcommittee. We had before us the measure as it passed the other House, a tentative draft which was prepared under the direction of the Senator from Georgia by the legislative draftsman, another draft which was prepared by the legislative experts of the Department of Agriculture at the suggestion of the new Food Administrator, and a draft which was again prepared under the direction of the Senator from Georgia. The full committee worked all over these drafts and produced the result which is now before the Senate.

As I said a moment ago, I think the Senator from Georgia is to be complimented on what he did. I did not agree with it in its entirety, and I made a motion in the committee to strike out section 4 (a). I intend to make such a motion again, so that the Senate may pass upon it, but, by and large, I think this measure has been given careful and constructive consideration by the committee.

Now, Mr. President, may I make a parliamentary inquiry? I ask what is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then a perfecting amendment is now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment to the committee amendment is in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to make one more brief statement; I have not yet yielded the floor. Naturally, I would not want to interrupt the

Senator from Wyoming, because he was kind enough to say some very nice things about me. Handling the joint resolution was the most thankless job I ever had to perform, and, in a few moments, I shall be glad to have the Senate take it over and do as it sees fit.

Mr. BYRD and Mr. HOLMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Georgia has made a very able and complete statement concerning the pending measure. There are several questions I should like to ask him. Did I understand him to say, in response to a question by the Senator from Oregon, that this measure removes the Agricultural Extension Service entirely from the control of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. The joint resolution does not affect that at all. The President, by Executive order, transferred the Extension Service and placed it under the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution. The joint resolution does not affect that. It was moved, as I understand, by Executive order of the President.

Mr. BYRD. There are two items to the joint resolution, one an appropriation not exceeding $20,000,000 to be expended through the State agricultural extension services, and then another $20,000,000 to be expended by the Food Administrator. Would it not be possible to coordinate the activities of these two agencies, as they would be doing the same work? The first, as I understand, will do the work within the States, moving the workers within the borders of the States?

Mr. RUSSELL. Largely recruiting them and transporting any necessary to move.

Mr. BYRD. And the second will move them from State to State? Will not these two organizations conflict with each other by doing the same work?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think they can. I may say to the Senator that I endeavored in the hearings on the joint resolution to make sure they would not.

Mr. BYRD. Both of them have the same powers and authority—the power to recruit and transport, and so forth, and so on. I do not see how the two can operate without some conflict and duplication of effort, because they have exactly the same powers, whether the laborers are moved within a State by the agency of the Agricultural Extension Service or are moved without a State by the other agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there can be any conflict even though there is a spelling out of powers. Both agencies are effective, the State extension service as well as the other for interstate and international movements, because all are under the supervision of the Administrator.

Mr. BYRD. Is it the purpose of the Food Administrator, as the Senator understands, to designate some agency of the Government to operate under section 3?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, he is going to use the extension agencies of the Government to operate under section 3. He is going to use the Federal Extension Service, and he intends to use the United States Employment Service. He will, undoubtedly, use some features of the farm security program camps which are already in existence.

Mr. BYRD. What features will he use, so far as the Senator is aware, of the farm-security program?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, the Administrator intends to see that the camps which the Farm Security Administration has already established for migratory labor will be operated under the provisions of this measure under his direction. He may use some facilities of the Farm Security Administration. I want to point out to the Senator from Virginia that all the drafts of the joint resolution had given both the Extension Service and the Administration the power to construct additional farm-labor camps, but, on my motion, the committee struck out that authority and there is now no power to construct any new or additional migratory labor camps.

Mr. BYRD. The joint resolution gives authority over "transportation, supervision, subsistence, protection, health and medical and burial services, and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary personal property." Would not that give the power to construct camps?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; because of the language in clause 3, 2 (a). If the Senator will look at that clause—I tried to point it out to the Senator, but evidently he did not understand me—he will note that the word "construction" was omitted. It was the first word, and the clause read "construction, lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers." The word "construction" was stricken out. The Administrator only has power to lease, repair, alter, and operate labor supply centers.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not think, then, since the joint resolution provides for shelter, that it would authorize the Administrator to build camps?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not.

Mr. BYRD. I do not see how the workers could be sheltered unless some houses or equipment were provided.

Mr. RUSSELL. This refers to the furnishing of loans or grants for shelters. It means that he could rent a house for workers or he could give them two or three dollars when they first land and before they have obtained jobs to enable them to stay in a boarding house a day or so, but it certainly does not relate to any construction. The word "construction," giving power to construct, was expressly stricken from the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Has the Senator any information as to whether the Farm Security will have power over these workers? They have had in the past.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I have some information on that, because that was practically the sole subject of discussion before the subcommittee for some 3 or 4 days. As nearly as I can understand the situation, the Farm Security Administration is to have absolutely no policy-making power to deal with any feature of this program.

Mr. BYRD. From whom did the Senator obtain that assurance?

Mr. RUSSELL. From the Secretary of Agriculture, from the Administrator of Food Distribution and Production, and from the extension services, which will handle the matter within the States; and they are the only people who have any power to control the expenditure of the funds.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator says he obtained the assurance from the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution. Did he obtain directly from Mr. Davis the assurance that he did not intend to use the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I did not, because I think it would be very foolish if he did not utilize some of those connected with the Farm Security Administration. There are agents of that organization in nearly every county in the United States, and if the authorities can use those agents in the program without the necessity of hiring new men, I think it would be very desirable to do so. I said that it was stated that no one in the Farm Security Administration would have any power to make any policies in the program.

Mr. BYRD. They would only use the camps and such other facilities as the Farm Security Administration now has?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. In the past millions of dollars have been spent on those camps.

Mr. BYRD. Would the Farm Security Administration operate the camps?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Administrator could let them operate them if he wished to, but if I understood Mr. Davis' statement—and I am not quoting him verbatim—I took his position to be that he did not intend to use the Farm Security Administration to formulate policies. My view is that Mr. Davis would utilize an employee of the Farm Security Administration who is already employed in the field, rather than employ a new one. He would be very foolish not to do that. Such employees are not going to be discharged between now and the 1st of July, and if he can avail himself of their services, I think he should do so.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator convinced in his own mind that Mr. Davis will not use the Farm Security Administration to the extent of it having equal influence?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am absolutely convinced of that, and I think every other member of the subcommittee who attended the hearings will give expression to the same opinion.

Mr. BYRD. There is one other question I should like to ask the Senator. At the bottom of page 6 the word "recruiting" is used. Who would fix the price of labor when the labor is recruited to go to another county or another State?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will turn to the provision on page 10, commencing in line 25, he will find a feature of the bill as it passed the House which caused us more difficulty than practi-

cally any other section. The language came to us from the House as follows:

That no part of the funds herein appropriated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor.

And so forth. It occurred to some of the members of the committee that if that language meant anything at all, it meant that it was not permissible even to go from one county to another and tell a man what wage he would receive if he were to move to another county to work. We undertook to amend it, particularly with respect to the agreement already entered into with the Mexican Government, by adding the following language:

Except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country.

We then added the following proviso:

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

In other words, under the language as it was construed by at least some members of the committee, it would not be possible to go to a worker in the State of Kentucky and say, "If you go up into Virginia and pick apples, we will give you so much a box," or "If you go to the Eastern Shore of Maryland and gather beans, we will pay you so much a crate." We did amend it so that they could be assured that they would get the going wage, whatever it was, whether it was for picking cotton, or whatever the work was.

Mr. BYRD. I presume that process would be followed so that if a group in a certain section of the country wanted labor, they would notify the workers what they would pay?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. And the price would not be determined by either one of the organizations concerned in the pending measure, as I understand?

Mr. RUSSELL. The man who wanted the labor would tell the people he was asking to supply the labor what those who wanted labor were willing to pay, and if the laborers were willing to work for that amount, he could get them.

Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. BUSHFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. I request that the Members of the Senate turn to page 11 and observe, in lines 8 and 9, the words "workers imported into the United States from a foreign country."

I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia to make an explanation for the RECORD, for the benefit of those who, like me, are jealous of breaking down the restrictions on immigration from foreign lands, so far as they relate to permanent residence.

I have two points in mind: First, that the language of the pending measure is ample to provide for the return of all workers permitted to enter the country under the joint resolution. The second point is that no language in the joint resolution would permit an influx of immigrants from all over the world in violation of existing immigration laws.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oregon was a member of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings, and I am sure that all the members of the subcommittee will bear testimony that the Senator from Oregon was most diligent in undertaking to establish that no person, alien-born, should be permitted to enter this country and take up permanent residence by virtue of any of the powers granted under the pending measure which might be exercised by any agency. The Senator was responsible for the inquiries being directed to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, as well as to the officials who would administer the proposed law, to make certain that all due precautions would be taken to see that such immigrants were returned to the countries of their origin as soon as they had concluded their contracts. That is certainly the intention of the committee, and I hope no person will be permitted to take up permanent residence in this country by virtue of admission under the terms of the joint resolution.

Mr. HOLMAN. I was well aware of that interpretation and that of the committee, but I wanted the record made. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield now to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in lines 15 and 16 on page 11 appears the language "and that shelter shall be provided for such workers." The Senator comes from a part of the country distant from where I have my residence. I am quite familiar with farming conditions throughout the Middle West, and I do not believe there is any place in the Middle West, in what are called the Prairie States, where it is necessary to construct shelters and housing for farm laborers. I am wondering whether that fact was taken into consideration by the committee when it raised the appropriation from $26,000,000 to $40,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; that fact was taken into consideration. Not a dime of the money is to be used for the construction of shelters. If the Senator will refer to the language in lines 15 and 16 he will see that it merely means that before a laborer can be transported from one State to another it is permissible to tell the laborer that he will have some kind of shelter when he gets to where he is to perform his work.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Then the agency would not undertake to force upon the producer or the farmer the necessity of constructing new shelters?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. The word "shelter" was used merely to avoid the confusion which has resulted from the efforts of the Farm Security Administration to fix a certain standard of housing throughout the country. That is the reason the word "shelter" was employed in drafting the bill.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I call attention to the hearing had before the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate on the subject of food supply of the United States. That hearing has been going on most of the winter. I recall very definitely the testimony of Mr. Chandler, of Florida, who represented the vegetable and fruit growers of Florida. He stated in his testimony, which appears in the record of the hearings, that he asked the Department of Agriculture for additional laborers, and the Department undertook to provide them, but when the laborers were sent there the agent in charge of the contingent of laborers rejected Mr. Chandler's housing, or the cabins which he had provided, which he had used for 20 years, and to which no one had ever previously objected. So the agent moved his crowd of workers into an adjacent open field, and housed them in tents, and told Mr. Chandler that he could not have those laborers because they were not provided the proper kind of housing.

I wish to supplement what the Senator from Arizona said concerning the situation in Arizona. Very interesting testimony concerning that subject was taken during the hearings to which I have referred. Mr. Abbott, representing the cotton growers of three or four States, said that at the solicitation of the Department of Agriculture they increased their acreage by 60 percent. He said those cotton farmers had to have 20,000 or 21,000 additional laborers.

The Department said the laborers would be furnished to them. All the Department ever did furnish was approximately 1,900 laborers, and the Department undertook to set up a standard contract of labor and wages by the hour, instead of by the pound, as cotton is picked. The thing is in a mess; and, as the distinguished Senator from Arizona said, that long-staple cotton still lies in the fields, practically a total loss. The cotton growers of Arizona alone lost ten million or eleven million dollars by the failure of the laborers the Department sent there.

I should like to read what the Graham County farmers' organization said about the laborers which were sent to them, as being of interest in connection with the present discussion:

We found a large portion of these workers were unfit for any kind of labor, namely, persons in the last stages of TB, who were told that Arizona was a mecca for such diseases, and that if they could get out there they might effect a cure, even if they couldn't work; that they would be given free medical care and attention and otherwise be taken care of. There were active cases of syphilis, confirmed alcoholics, and people choked up with asthma, who, by their own admission, had not done a day's work in 2 years; women expecting to become mothers any minute, men over 70 years of age, and jailbirds with long prison records, as well as old, worn-out prostitutes.

That is the type of laborers the Farm Security Administration furnished the State of Arizona.

I read what Mr. Abbott said in his testimony about this kind of an appropriation, and with this I conclude my remarks in connection with the question:

Now, on coming back here, I find that they have asked this same group who blocked us last year, asked for sixty-five or seventy million dollars. I guess that is to do the same thing to other people that they did to us.

I want to register before this committee a very definite protest on the part of my people, and also myself as an American citizen and a farmer, against this Congress appropriating $17,000,000 for the construction of camps which are not needed. Every farmer has room for labor, and in only a few instances will it be found necessary to establish small, rolling, gathering camps for the harvesting of berries.

Of course, the distinguished Senator says the matter of construction of camps has been eliminated from the bill, but I wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate the testimony which came before our subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, we received testimony practically to the same effect as that mentioned by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. There is, however, a difference in the several areas of the country, particularly in some of the vegetable and fruit areas, and if some kind of camps are not provided it is very difficult indeed to handle the labor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say a word in addition to what the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] has stated regarding the testimony of Mr. Chandler from Florida. Mr. Chandler did come before us and say that his buildings had been condemned, and that the labor that was secured through Farm Security Administration was unsatisfactory. However, at a later date—and I am not sure the Senator from South Dakota was present—Mr. Baldwin, of the Farm Security Administration, came before the committee and stated that they had not condemned any of Mr. Chandler's buildings; that they had furnished him with 20 hands, 2 of whom had been returned as unsatisfactory, but he quite emphatically denied that they had condemned the buildings.

We also had, as the Senator from South Dakota said, the testimony from Mr. Abbott, of Arizona. I have heard no word from the Farm Security Administration or from anyone else contradicting his testimony. So possibly there is more basis for that complaint than there is for the one from Florida, which was denied by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in a colloquy had a few moments ago with the able Senator in charge of the bill, I asked him the question what the attitude of the farm representatives was with respect to the House bill and the Senate amendments, and he answered, as always, with clarity and frankness. Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the Farm Bureau Federation, a short while ago sent me a letter regarding that organization's attitude, which at this time I ask unanimous consent to have read by the clerk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read the letter.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

APRIL 8, 1943.

Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCNARY: In order that there may be no misunderstanding of the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation with respect to House Joint Resolution 96, I wish to advise that we believe the provisions of this bill as passed by the House, together with the amendments which we submitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee, constitute a more workable and effective program than the bill reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Our board gave this whole matter extended consideration during its recent meeting in Washington and, after careful study, strongly recommended that the Extension Service be given this responsibility with authority to utilize the facilities of the Employment Service or other agencies through cooperative agreements.

Under the plan which we have recommended, and which is embodied in the House bill, the Food Administrator has ample authority to supervise the administration of this program, since he must approve all programs and projects and the expenditure of all funds under the terms of existing cooperative agreements of the Extension Service with the Department of Agriculture and under the terms of the President's Executive order creating the Food Administration.

Very truly yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am always very happy when I can be in agreement with the distinguished head of the Farm Bureau Federation on any legislative matter, but, of course, I realize that I have a responsibility to the people over and beyond any responsibility to the Farm Bureau Federation. I wish to say again that, in my judgment, the bill which the Farm Bureau Federation asked the committee to support and report was absolutely unworkable and that it could not have functioned at all, because it undertook to apply the rules of a matching provision in the Smith-Lever Act to this bill, in connection with which all the funds are Federal funds. While I should like to be in agreement with Mr. O'Neal, I want to say again that I think he is as far wrong as he could possibly be and that, if we were to pass the bill which the Farm Bureau Federation wrote for the House and succeeded in inducing the House to pass, we might as well throw the $26,100,000 out the window, because we would not be able to get one laborer from anywhere and make him available to any farmer in the country.

There is one other provision of the joint resolution which I desire to call to the attention of the Senate, and then I shall be through. I wish to point out that I have not utilized all the time which has passed while I have been on my feet. I desire particularly to call the attention of the Senate to subsection (f) on page 13, because it is a provision which affects other legislation, and I think the Senate should be fully apprised of the provisions of the subsection.

It was brought to the attention of the subcommittee that there was in the country a large reservoir of labor of both men and women past 65 years of age who now, on account of rules in various States, are receiving sums by way of old-age assistance. A great many such persons have a farm background; and, while they do not have the physical strength of the younger farm workers, they have the experience and the knowledge which are so vitally needed today on the farms, where high-school boys and girls are attempting to do work which is somewhat technical in nature. There is a rule or provision of law, or it may be a regulation of the Social Security Board—I am not quite clear which it is—which provides that if any person earns any money while receiving old-age assistance, that fact shall be taken into consideration in determining whether such person is in need. In many of the States the old people who have undertaken to relieve the farm labor shortage by doing a little work found that they would be taken off the old-age assistance rolls and would be denied the amounts they were receiving by way of old-age assistance. Naturally, as soon as word of that got around, the others were very slow to accept employment on the farms.

The subsection does say that hereafter, for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter, there shall not be a Federal rule that the funds received for performing agricultural labor shall be considered in determining old-age assistance need. That is a matter affecting laws which have not been under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee, and I thought I should call the matter especially to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, let me say that the joint resolution falls far short of being perfect. There are in it a great many provisions of which I do not approve. However, it represents approximately 2 or 3 weeks of very earnest effort on the part of the subcommittee. We believe it will work. We believe that the county agents and State extension services will be able to mobilize sufficient high-school boys and girls and other resources of labor within the States, in conjunction with labor which is to be brought in from outside the States, to enable us to harvest this year's crops. We are not going to have adequate farm labor, and that which we do have will suffer for lack of actual experience in the very highly technical business of farming; but by the full utilization of the labor which is available, with the slight back-to-the-farm movement which has been noted lately as those who have rushed off to employment in industry have seen that "all that glisters is not gold" and have encountered the difficulties of rationing and have in their mind's eye gone back to the good old days on the farm when they could have all the butter and all the meat they wished, together with the forces which will be mobilized under the pending joint resolution, the committee

believes we should be able to harvest this year's crops, and, with favorable conditions, we can virtually succeed in reaching the goals which have been fixed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. With reference to the statement just made with respect to subsection (f), I offered the amendment in the subcommittee, and the subcommittee accepted the amendment. Later it was redrafted by our drafting service, and was approved by the full committee. Since the committee reported the bill and submitted a report on it, the Social Security authorities have considered the amendment; and the meaning of the amendment is not exactly clear in the minds of some of those who must administer the act.

It is the fear of the Administrator of the Social Security Service—I refer to Governor McNutt—that if the amendment should be adopted in its present form it might provide for an addition to the old-age pension rolls of a substantial number of persons. That was not the intent of the amendment. In order that the intent of the amendment may be made as clear, I desire to offer for the RECORD the interpretation of the committee with respect to the amendment. I ask that the interpretation be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the interpretation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 5 (f) provides that compensation earned for agricultural labor shall not be taken into consideration in determining the need of individuals for old-age assistance under title 1 of the Social Security Act. That title now provides for grants-in-aid to the States for old-age assistance, and provides that such grants will be made only with respect to assistance for needy individuals. The purpose of this subsection is to permit recipients of old-age assistance to work as agricultural workers during the war, and for 6 months thereafter, without having such assistance discontinued or reduced.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if I may proceed for just another moment, let me say that the purpose of the amendment is to permit persons on the old-age pension rolls to accept employment at agricultural labor and to accept remuneration for such labor without in any way altering or changing their status as recipients of old-age assistance.

In order that the amendment may be clarified, I propose the proviso which I send to the desk and ask to have stated for the information of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated for the benefit of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, at the end of line 22, strike out the period, and add a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That this subsection (f) shall not be construed to alter or amend any provision of existing law save that during the time mentioned any person receiving old-age assistance shall be entitled to receive remuneration for agricultural labor performed without in any way whatever altering, changing, or modifying his or her status as recipients of old-age assistance.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I think that this clarification proviso covers the point which has been raised by Governor McNutt. Let me say that if the proviso is adopted, along with the statement of intent made by the committee, then if it goes to conference, no doubt Governor McNutt will be called into conference; and if in conference any further change is made in the section or in the clarifying amendment, it will be agreeable so far as I am concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am a member of the subcommittee which considered the bill and, therefore, I feel it incumbent upon me to make a statement with regard to it. Unfortunately, as so often occurs in the Senate, there was a conflict of duties, and on several occasions I had to be absent from meetings of the subcommittee. Consequently I am not as fully conversant with all the proceedings as I otherwise would be.

For that reason, in the committee I took the position of reserving my right to study the joint resolution further when it came to the floor, and at that time to take any action which I might deem appropriate.

I attended a sufficient number of the meetings of the committee to enable me to bear witness to the splendid work which was done there by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to say a word of praise for his industry and intelligence, and to express my own belief that no other Member of this body could grasp a problem of this kind better than could he. Whether or not the measure becomes law, certainly the contribution which the Senator from Georgia has made to the subject is noteworthy, and deserves our gratitude.

Of course, the joint resolution also has a tremendously worthy aim which must be approved by every Member of the Senate—the aim of taking practical steps to meet the farm-labor shortage. The aim of trying to move people from areas where there is a surplus of manpower into areas where there is a shortage of manpower is a profoundly appealing objective; but none of those considerations, appealing as they are, mitigate the fact that the joint resolution is full of moot questions of very far-reaching import, involving grave considerations of national policy. I am prepared to concede that the Senator from Georgia and the other members of the subcommittee considered all these questions with the utmost care, and that they conducted the hearings in the most orderly way. However, at the same time, questions of policy and questions of opinion, which are not secondary questions at all, are involved in the joint resolution.

The joint resolution clearly impinges on the question of immigration. I accept the statements which have been made that it would not change the quota system. I do not believe it would; but I am not at all clear in my mind as to the effect which the joint resolution would have on the laws regarding the head tax or what effect it would have on the question of immigrants becoming public charges. I do not know. I do not think anyone knows.

I notice the provision that the gentleman who is to administer the act shall cooperate with the Secretary of State. That brings to mind a picture of both of them working together. Of course, the question of immigration involves a great deal more than the Secretary of State. It involves other departments. It is my understanding that the proposed legislation has never been cleared by the State Department. It certainly brings up the question of treaties and foreign relations.

Another thing which I do not like in the joint resolution is that the money proposed to be appropriated may be distributed without precept, directive, formula, or yardstick of any kind. I realize that the members of the subcommittee have thought about this, and that they believe that the situation is such that no formula or amendment could be drafted which would meet the needs. However, it is an important consideration with some of us on the committee that there should be such a precept.

I am in doubt as to the effect which the impact of this measure would have on our contract-labor law. I do not say that it would have any. I do not know. However, the more one reads some of these measures the more he wonders.

So while I heartily approve the stated purpose of the joint resolution, and while I pay tribute to the sincerity and intelligence of the Senators who drafted it and worked on it, I believe the proper course to take now would be to refer the joint resolution to a committee, preferably the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I so move, Mr. President.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, is my motion now before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts, which is a preferential motion.

Mr. LODGE. I move to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President; a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the motion debatable?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is debatable.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to be heard for a few moments on the motion.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I asked the Senator to yield in order to ascertain what he hopes would be accomplished by referring the joint resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has no jurisdiction over the question of immigration which he raises. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has no jurisdiction over the question of foreign affairs which he raises. Why did he select that committee? None of his objections has anything to do with the functions performed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LODGE. So far as that is concerned, the Appropriations Committee has nothing to do with those questions, either.

Mr. HAYDEN. We understand that; and that has been explained many times to the Senate, with respect to the W. P. A., the National Youth Administration, and other agencies, as well as in this instance. However, when the House passes a measure which contains both an appropriation and legislation, it must go to the Appropriations Committee. We did not seek it. The joint resolution was handed to us. I am trying to find out why the Senator from Massachusetts selected the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to meet the objections which he raises, which have nothing to do with the functions of that committee.

Mr. LODGE. The reason I selected the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is that the prime purpose of the joint resolution is to relieve the agricultural situation. I know that I should be very much more severely criticized than I am now being criticized if I were to seek to have the joint resolution referred to the Committee on Immigration or the Committee on Foreign Relations. I can imagine what some Senators might say to me then.

Mr. HAYDEN. In that case our answer would be that neither of those committees would have any occasion to act upon the joint resolution, because it does not affect the immigration laws, and does not affect our foreign relations, as everyone must know who is familiar with the way in which the proposed legislation would operate.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator cannot correctly say that it does not affect our foreign relations because he knows very well that it has to do with the importation of foreign labor and that the joint resolution has not been cleared by the State Department.

Mr. HAYDEN. We had witnesses from the State Department before the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Can the Senator point to anything in writing from the State Department indicating that the Department approves it?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. It was not necessary to obtain a report. All the joint resolution does is, in effect, to provide that the existing agreement made with Mexico by the State Department shall be carried out unless it is hereafter modified.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator knows that there is nothing in the joint resolution which would limit such agreements to Mexico. Such agreements might be made with Venezuela, San Domingo, or any other country.

Mr. HAYDEN. The State Department has approved the two existing agreements. One is with Mexico and the other with the Government of the Bahama Islands. Those agreements stand unless it is desirable to renegotiate them, in which case Mr. Davis is directed to cooperate with the State Department.

I cannot conceive of any purpose the Senator can have in mind in making the motion except to delay relief which the farmers of the Nation need in obtaining labor to take care of crops which are now being put in the ground. Why kill time?

Mr. LODGE. What motive could I have for doing so?

Mr. HAYDEN. Knowing the Senator as I do I cannot understand what his motive could be.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is unworthy of the Senator from Arizona to make such a statement; and I believe that when he thinks about it a little more he will realize that he did not mean it. He knows perfectly well that no Senator is more desirous than I am of solving this problem. I made it very plain when I began that I heartily endorse the purpose of the joint resolution, but I am not sure that it would achieve the announced purpose. It does neither the Senator from Arizona nor anyone else any credit to say that I wish to delay bringing relief to the farmer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I invite the Senator's attention to subdivision (3) on page 10. The Senator spoke of what the State Department thought about the measure. Subdivision (3) on page 10 provides that the Administrator shall cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign governments relating to the importation of workers into the United States. That refers to the second half of the joint resolution. Instead of leaving the State Department out of it, it merely enforces the agreement which the State Department has already made and provides for cooperation with the State Department in making any future agreements. Under the circumstances in which we find ourselves, with the necessity for importing workers from other countries, it seems to me that that is the logical, most effective, and most expeditious way of dealing with the subject. The joint resolution does not exclude the State Department, the Department of Agriculture, or any other department, but provides for cooperation.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator does not allege, does he, that that rather peculiar language "to cooperate with the Secretary of State" has been approved by the State Department?

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that it has the entire approval of the State Department. I do not think there was any evidence to that effect. There is none in the hearings; but we were assured that it is entirely satisfactory to the State Department. That is the reason why that particular provision was included.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. My recollection of what was said about this matter in the Committee on Appropriations is that the State Department had not cleared the proposed legislation in any respect. If I may say a word further, reference has been made to an agreement with Mexico. The provision just referred to by the Senator from Tennessee not only relates to existing agreements with Mexico or with any other nation, but gives authority of a dubious character with respect to all negotiations which may hereafter be carried on, or agreements which may hereafter be negotiated.

I do not know what the joint resolution means when it says that the Administrator is authorized to cooperate. My impression is that that is a dilution of the authority of the Secretary of State, and makes the Administrator, to some degree at least, a partner with the Secretary of State in the negotiation and renegotiation of such agreements. I agree with what the Senator from Massachusetts has said about this particular provision.

Mr. McKELLAR. It applies solely to the importation of farm workers and that is why reference is made to it. It does not give the Administrator any authority to deal with other agreements, but merely to cooperate with the State Department, and it is perfectly natural and proper that it should.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Because of the fact that the State Department has been brought into the discussion of the pending measure, I should like to point out that in the very unusual efforts made to work out the proposed legislation a joint meeting was held between the members of the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations of the House Appropriations Committee and six or eight Members of the House who were interested and members of the Senate committee. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee invited the Secretary of State to attend the meeting. The Secretary of State sent representatives who stated to the joint conference—it does not appear in the hearings because I did not have the proceedings reported due to the fact it was a combined meeting of the two committees—that they had no interest in the measure other than to work with the agency in which the power should finally be delegated in an effort to negotiate these treaties, and that they would gladly work with any agency on which power was conferred by Congress to attempt to obtain agricultural labor.

As a matter of fact, the agreements made prior to that time had been negotiated under the auspices of the State

Department and were signed by representatives of the Department, attesting to the fact that the Department had had full knowledge of all agreements made, and had participated in making them. There has been no effort made to short-circuit the State Department. The State Department has been consulted, and it has no objections whatever to the pending joint resolution. It went further and stated that it would be happy to work with whatever agency the Congress saw fit to designate in placing responsibility for securing the labor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Massachusetts has referred to some of the provisions in the joint resolution not being as plain as he would like them to be. What the Senator has said may be true. There may be provisions in the joint resolution which are not as plain as they should be, but there is one thing, Mr. President, which is plain. It is plain to Congress, it is plain to the President, and it is plain to the people of the United States that this Nation needs food. It is plain that our Army needs food, and it is plain that it is time to plant the crops. The farmers of the Nation are entitled to know whether they shall have labor with which to plant their crops and whether they shall have labor to harvest the crops if they shall be planted.

I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator from Georgia for the thoroughness with which he has handled the pending measure, and for the study he has given to it. Mr. President, it is one of the most important pieces of legislation which has come before this session of Congress, because it involves food for our people and food for our Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I agree with the statements made by distinguished Senators all along the line. I am very glad the Senator from Georgia brought this joint resolution up today because I think the sooner it is enacted into law the better it will be for the crop situation in America.

I was detained in the Appropriations Committee on another matter, and as I came into the Chamber a few moments ago I heard a letter being read from my good friend O'Neal of the American Farm Bureau Federation. He is one of the finest men in the world. He and I have been devoted friends for many years. He and I were born in the same section of Alabama. In general, we have had much the same views with respect to the farmers of the country. I did not understand that Mr. O'Neal had the slightest objection to the first section of the joint resolution. Indeed, from the standpoint of Mr. O'Neal and my own standpoint, I think it is superior to the section in the measure passed by the other House. It will be remembered that the House section provided that $13,500,000 could be expended by the Extension Services.

The section under discussion provides that not less than $13,500,000 shall be available for the agricultural extension services, and not more than $20,000,000 may be expended in that way. From the standpoint of expenditures by local authorities, such as the agricultural extension service of each State, it is, to my mind, a much better provision than the one originally contained in the House joint resolution. I think the greatest benefit which would probably result from this measure would be the benefit coming from the activities of the agricultural extension services.

From talking to Mr. O'Neal since the joint resolution was reported, I am quite sure that he is in full and hearty sympathy with the first half of it dealing with the extension services.

With regard to the expenditure of further funds, the amount has been increased to $20,000,000. Western States, such as Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, and Idaho, are greatly interested in obtaining labor principally from Mexico. Our country has an agreement with Mexico by which that may be done. Section 2 of the joint resolution largely carries out that agreement. It is true that its administration has been put into the charge of Mr. Davis, who is the new head of the agricultural section dealing with this matter. That is entirely proper. I do not see how we could do otherwise. Under the joint resolution as passed by the House, the administration of the provision to which reference has been made was placed in the land-grant colleges of the country. I doubt the wisdom of that. I think Mr. Davis ought to be put in charge of it.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has had charge of the joint resolution. I was chairman of the subcommittee which dealt with it, but was ill at the time and could not take charge. I desire to say that I think the measure is better than anything I could have prepared. I think the Senator from Georgia has done a very fine piece of work in both these matters. I am not so sure that he agreed with everything that the subcommittee put into the measure so far as the first section is concerned; but being a careful and prudent legislator, he gave and took, and therefore he agreed to the first section as it was written. So far as the extension services of the various States are concerned, the joint resolution could not possibly have been improved upon by anyone.

The second part of the joint resolution is considerably more difficult because we had to deal with the situation as it existed in foreign countries. A number of States such as Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, Idaho, and other western States—even the splendid State of the distinguished Senator from Michigan—depend on these outside agencies for the furnishing of labor. It is a very important matter to the Senator from Michigan, as well as to his State, because they have to depend on labor obtained from outside sources, particularly in the growing and harvesting of sugar beets. I believe the same condition applies to the State of New York, and perhaps in a lesser degree to other States. But the principal northern States to which this section applies are Michigan first, then New York, and then to other States in a lesser degree. I think the provision with respect to the second $20,000,000 is certainly agreeable to those States. It certainly ought to be agreeable to them under any circumstances.

To deal with such a subject, manifestly, was very difficult. I do not think our subcommittee ever passed upon a measure that has been more carefully and more painstakingly prepared than this one was prepared by the subcommitteee. It was almost unanimously agreed to by the full committee. With the exception of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]—I do not recall any other Senators—who reserved the right after examining the joint resolution to vote for it or against it, it received the unanimous approval of both the full committee and the subcommittee. I think the Senator from Massachusetts stated a few moments ago that he felt then, as he feels now, that he did not know whether it would work as it has been arranged.

I think the provision which was written into the bill through the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] under which old men who receive benefit payments from the Government are allowed to work on a farm and not lose such benefits, is an admirable provision at this time of our great stress, and I think we may depend upon those men to do excellent work on the farm or, at least, most of them. It seems to me that is an excellent provision.

If Senators will look at the limitations provided on pages 10 and 11 and the "miscellaneous provisions" of the joint resolution I think he will realize that the subcommittee and the full committee undertook in every way they could to hedge it about in such a way as to bring the greatest benefit to the farmers of the country and, at the same time, do as little harm as possible. For that reason, I sincerely hope that the motion of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will not be agreed to, for I believe that if the joint resolution were sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry it could not be improved.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. DAVIS addressed the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from West Virginia rose first, and I yield first to him.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator please look at line 25 on page 10.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The joint resolution appropriates $40,000,000 and provides that—

> (b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or heretofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor—

That is very clear, but this language follows—

> except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to

comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country.

I ask the Senator does that mean that the moneys appropriated under this joint resolution may be used directly or indirectly to fix or regulate union membership and to enforce collective-bargaining with respect to persons imported from other countries to labor in the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not exactly that. I wish to say to the Senator—and I am glad he has asked the question—that, while I was not present when that provision was placed in the joint resolution, I was present when it was subsequently discussed.

The reason for it was that under the agreement now existing between the United States and Mexico—I do not know whether there is an agreement with any other country or not; I have forgotten; perhaps there may be one with the Bahama Islands—but under the agreement with Mexico it is provided that there shall be a minimum wage paid those coming from Mexico. I am familiar with that. That is the reason for making the exception to which the Senator refers which reads:

except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country, and then only—

I call the attention of the Senator to these words:

and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the governments of such foreign country.

I have not the agreement before me, but there is such an agreement, and the Senator from Georgia, who is not for the moment in the Chamber, is familiar with it. The Senator from Arizona who has taken a very great interest in the matter, and whose State is greatly interested in this proposed legislation, is also familiar with it. That agreement provides that there shall be a minimum wage, and, perhaps shelter, provided to workers who are imported from Mexico. Of course we are obliged, in carrying out that agreement with a foreign country, to write in the measure such language as will effectuate it. That is the reason for it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to ask another question, if I may address it to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Why, then, if the agreement provides for shelter and for minimum hours or wages, has there been written into this measure that with respect to the workers brought in from foreign countries the money appropriated may be used to enforce collective bargaining and union membership?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee permits me at this point, let me say that there is nothing in the Mexican agreement that has anything to do with union membership or collective bargaining.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then, why is such a provision in the joint resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. This is a prohibition against a practice which grew up in the United States, as alleged by some persons, at least, and is designed to meet objections of that kind. The House put in the measure a provision which made it unworkable. If the Senator will read the words as they appear prior to the word "except," in line 7, he will find that is the text of the House bill. If we said that none of the money appropriated by this measure could be used for any of the purposes mentioned, and the Mexican agreement provides for any one of those things, then none of this money could be used to bring workers from Mexico. One of the provisions in the agreement with Mexico is for a minimum wage of 30 cents an hour, and there is a provision that there shall be suitable housing. None of the other provisions are in the Mexican agreement. Therefore, the Senate committee simply provided that the prohibition as written by the other House should apply except to the extent that the Mexican agreement might modify it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is there any other agreement except the Mexican agreement?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is one relating to the importation of some 5,000 persons from the Bahama Islands. Those are the only two I know of at the present time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Bahama agreement include any other provisions than those for minimum pay and for housing?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is all as I understand. The Bahama agreement is very similar to the Mexican agreement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am practically through. I desire to add to what I have already said that I am opposed to the joint resolution being referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or to any other committee, because the House committee dealt with it as an appropriation bill, and the House dealt with it as an appropriation bill, and, necessarily, it went to the Appropriations Committee and, necessarily, it should not go to any other committee. All these matters no doubt will be very accurately worked out in conference, and in conference we may have to have a give and take process, such as we all know frequently happens.

Time is of the essence in the situation. Today is the 8th of April. In the section of the country from which I come, when I was a boy we were planting crops at this time of the year. We are considering a condition affecting the southern tier of States, and we should act at the very earliest possible moment.

I had very little to do with working out the joint resolution. I returned to the Senate, after being ill, the last day or two of its consideration, but the other members of the committee have worked out what I think is a most admirable measure, which I believe will result in the production of additional crops to a greater degree than under any other measure which could be suggested.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Pennsylvania asked me to yield, and I yield to him first.

Mr. DAVIS. As I understand, there are now two countries which have agreements with the United States regarding labor.

Mr. McKELLAR. I so understand.

Mr. DAVIS. Under the measure now pending could the Secretary of State enter into agreements with other countries, and bring in workers from countries other than the two which have been named?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, some mention has been made in the press of the fact that there might be some importations of labor from the island of Jamaica. That is the only other country mentioned, so far as I know. That, I believe, is due to the fact that because of the shortage of shipping, the agricultural crops from Jamaica could not be exported, and it was thought some of the workers might be brought to this country to help on a basis similar to that under which laborers are being brought from Mexico and the Bahamas.

Mr. DAVIS. Have the agreements already entered into been made a part of the RECORD, are they set forth in the hearings?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have not been on the floor during every minute of the discussion, and it may be that the question I wish to ask has already been answered, but it runs in my mind that some weeks ago, possibly some months ago, certainly rather recently, at any rate, the Secretary of Agriculture spent some time in Mexico, with assistants, working out a plan whereby the labor question between the United States and Mexico would be very well handled. I wondered whether it was necessary to have further legislation of this kind at the moment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am familiar with the matter, and if the Senator from Tennessee will yield to me, I shall be glad to answer the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. No legislation is contemplated which would make any provision with respect to the Mexican agreement, except to allow it to operate. In the form in which the pending joint resolution passed the House, it required a renegotiation of the agreement with Mexico within 30 days. If there were no new agreement with Mexico within 30 days, we would not obtain any labor from that country at all.

The testimony before the committee was that while the agreement with Mexico is not entirely satisfactory, and perhaps we might get a better one sometime, it is the only one we now have. It provides a limitation that not more than 50,000 Mexicans may enter the United States under the agreement, and up to now less than 10,000 have come in. As a matter of fact, we have spent much time, in the committee and in the Senate, discussing the very smallest degree of help the farmers will get. The great bulk of the money carried in the second part of the joint resolution is not to be spent to bring in foreigners, it is to be expended in taking labor from one part of the United States to another. Customarily there has been a migration, up to half a

million people, from one part of the country to another. Those people cannot travel now because they cannot get gasoline and tires; so it is necessary for the Federal Government to provide them with some form of transportation, and the money proposed to be appropriated will provide for it.

The major portion of the money carried in the second part of the measure will be expended, not to transport foreigners but to move people from one State to another, as the crops require.

Mr. BUTLER. The other question I have in mind is prompted by what happened this morning in the Committee on Banking and Currency when Chairman McNutt, of the War Manpower Commission, testified to the great unemployment which exists in the State of New York, which was mentioned by the Senator a moment ago. I wanted to be sure that we were going first to take care of the unemployment there is within our own country before we become too much concerned about bringing people in from foreign countries.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator's remark is entirely accurate, and I agree with him. What he seeks is provided for in the joint resolution. There is an additional provision allowing those who are receiving small payments from the Government to work without losing such payments.

I hope the pending motion will be voted down, and that the very excellent joint resolution now pending will be passed and allowed to go to conference this afternoon.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Tennessee knows my great admiration and respect for him and the pleasure it always gives me to follow him. There is one thing which bothers me about the pending joint resolution. Section 2 creates an organization to recruit and to do several other things within the States. That refers to the Agricultural Extension Service. It is made mandatory; that organization must be used.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator agrees with that section of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. I entirely agree with it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That applies to one-half of it.

Mr. BYRD. The part with which I do not agree is section 3, because it sets up a duplicate organization to do the same work.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. BYRD. To recruit, and place, and do all the other things which section 2 provides for, so far as labor sent out of a State is concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; that provides that this department shall have jurisdiction to do that work, but no provision is made for setting up any new bureau.

Mr. BYRD. I did not say a new bureau; I said another organization. One is made mandatory for the labor within the State. That is fixed, is it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is fixed.

Mr. BYRD. Section 3 provides for another organization, which would not use the organization set up by section 2. It may be the United States Employment Service, it may be the Farm Security Administration, it may be any other agency of the Government.

Mr. HAYDEN. But the Senator will agree that a State extension service cannot go into another State, or across the United States to recruit labor, and set up an organization to do it.

Mr. BYRD. The recruiting is done within the State.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let us understand the picture in some proportion. From 85 to 90 percent of the labor that is to be moved in order to handle crops is going to move inside the State. Everyone knows that. So 10 percent of the labor has to be found somewhere else. That which is to be inside the State is to be in the hands of the State extension service, and that is where the great benefit will come from the joint resolution. As to the 10 percent to be obtained from outside the State, it is not possible to send a county agent or a State extension director into another State.

Mr. BYRD. There is a county agent in every county in the United States. It is not necessary to send a county agent from one State to another. There is an administrator who is in charge of all county agents. There are three thousand-odd counties, and every one has a county agent. It is not necessary to send an agent from Virginia to Tennessee. We can send requisitions to the Administrator here for the labor, and he can then distribute it to the respective States. That does not mean that a county administrator or agent would come to my State of Virginia, because there is a central agency in Washington to handle the matter. I cannot understand why there is a desire to create two organizations to do the same work.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not proposed to create two organizations to do the same work. One is to recruit labor in the State.

Mr. BYRD. It is recruiting labor.

Mr HAYDEN. Yes; but it is not the same labor.

Mr. BYRD. There is only a certain amount of labor to recruit. If there are two agencies recruiting the labor, we add to the confusion, and they compete with each other.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has a total misconception of how the measure would operate. We appropriate money for these purposes—one function to be inside the State and one outside the State. The only way to handle anything outside a State is to perform it as a Federal function. That is what is provided for.

Mr BYRD. It is all performed as a Federal function because the Food Administrator has the right to direct and to veto everything a county agent may do. It is not a local function, anyway.

Mr. HAYDEN. How would the Senator correct it? If he objects, how would he correct it?

Mr. BYRD. I would use the Agricultural Extension Service to do the recruiting, for example.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is, the Senator would send the county agents from Arizona to Virginia to recruit laborers and take them to a different place?

Mr. BYRD. No. If the Senator from Arizona will permit, I should like to make clear what I mean. Let us say there are 100 unemployed persons in my county of Clarke in Virginia. Those persons are available for labor. Why should two agencies be able to recruit that labor?

Mr. HAYDEN. Under the pending measure two agencies would not recruit that labor.

Mr. BYRD. The bill provides for it. It provides—

> The purposes for which such funds may be expended by such extension services shall include, among other things, the recruiting, placement * * * and training of such workers; * * * transportation, supervision—

And a long list of things they may do. The same authority and the same activity is exactly duplicated under section 3 for some other agency of the Government. If that is not a duplication I simply cannot read the English language.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not a duplication, because it applies to a different set of persons.

Mr. BYRD. I understand that, but the recruiting of labor is one activity, is it not, whether the labor is used in the State or outside the State?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but the recruiting must be done by a Federal agent outside the State to move the labor inside the State.

Mr. BYRD. Even a farm agent cannot prevent a laborer being taken from his county if an appeal is taken to the Food Administrator and the Food Administrator sustains the appeal.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator objects to the Food Administrator doing it, who does he want to do it?

Mr. BYRD. I do not object to the Food Administrator doing it. I object to two agencies doing it. What I object to is a duplication of effort. I wish to do something in a simple economical way.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator knows I agree with him very heartily on the subject of duplication of effort. He and I have been working for about a year and a half to try to accomplish something along the line of prevention of duplication of effort.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Tennessee has rendered a most valuable service in that respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have looked into this matter most carefully, and in view of the fact that the Federal Government appropriates all the money I am utterly unable to see why it is not entirely proper to place a Federal bureau in charge of the work. We have been assured that no additional help will be requested; that no additional agencies will be set up, but that the work will be done within the bureau, under the direction of the head of the bureau, who is, I think, a satisfactory person to have charge of it. He is so much better than some who might be chosen that I am almost willing to leave it to him. I am quite sure that this money will be spent to the very best

advantage to the farmers who are affected by the measure, and that it will be the best possible way to get an increase of food for the coming year.

Mr. BYRD. I am not objecting to the Senator's statement insofar as the need of some organization is concerned, but what I am objecting to is that this provision creates two organizations; it creates one within the State to be conducted by the Agricultural Extension Service which is under the control of the National Administrator. This is all a national function. Every dollar of the money to be used is being appropriated by the Federal Government. It sets up another organization which is not described in the bill. It may be the Farm Credit Administration. There is no definite guaranty made to Members of the Senate that the Farm Credit Administration, an organization to which there is great objection in Congress, will not be the agency which will undertake the activities under section 3, and which will thereby duplicate and compete with the efforts of the Agricultural Extension Service in the recruitment of labor and the other activities provided for in the measure.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I suppose there is no other State which more imperatively needs the assistance provided by some such measure as this than the State of California. I wish to make a statement concerning what I understand to be the actual working of the joint resolution. We in California first must be able to move around our own labor within the State in order to meet the changing needs of our farmers. In addition, after Mexican workers are brought into the State we will then have to have some agency within the State which will be able to move such Mexican workers around. Insofar as the handling of the transient farm workers in California, who are there now, or after they are brought in, the farm extension service will be admirably adapted to do that, and will be empowered by this joint resolution to do it. But I wish to say to to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, whose courage and intellect I so very much admire, that I do not see how any farm extension agency in the State of California would have the power or the personnel or the authority to go down into Mexico and recruit Mexican workers. I feel that we must have some superior Federal agency which can recruit workers from Mexico or some other foreign country and transport them into the State.

Mr. BYRD. Let me ask the Senator a question. The Agricultural Extension Service is a large organization. The personnel of that organization could be used to go to Mexico or to go to any other country under the direction of the Food Administrator. All this, it will be remembered, is under the direction of the Food Administrator. Section 2 provides for administration by the Agricultural Extension Service, which is under the Food Administrator, and so does section 3. If labor from Mexico is needed, there is now existing in the Agricultural Extension Service a personnel which could be sent to Mexico to recruit the labor.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me invite the attention of the Senator from Virginia to this situation: Probably there are 5 or 10 or 15 States, principally in the West and the Southwest, which, we hope, will have workers from Mexico assisting farmers in those States. Manifestly, farm extension workers in Arizona could not go to Mexico and recruit laborers for Arizona. California farm extension workers could not go to Mexico and recruit laborers for California. The same thing is true with respect to farm extension workers in Montana, Wyoming, and other States. So it seems to me that some bureau or agency must be set up by the Federal Government which would have the personnel necessary to go into Mexico to recruit workers.

Mr. BYRD. The Agricultural Extension Service, as the Senator from California knows, is not confined to farm agents. If it were necessary to add to that organization, it would not be a difficult thing to do. Personnel could be added to that organization if additional personnel were needed. What I object to is that two organizations are set up under this bill to do practically the same work, insofar as recruiting labor is concerned. There is no guaranty whatever to anyone that the Farm Security Administration, to which an overwhelming majority of the Senate and of the House are bitterly opposed, will not be designated as the agency under section 3 to perform this work.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, as I recall the testimony of Mr. Chester Davis, who appeared before the committee only a few days after he was appointed Food Administrator, he testified that he was not able at that time to go into the detail of this matter, but he would like to speak about the over-all picture.

I believe this measure is quite largely the result of the understanding of the committee of the problems presented by Mr. Davis, plus the House bill which came to the Senate and which was undoubtedly directed toward eliminating the Farm Security Administration from handling this particular feature of the farm-labor problem. So determined was the House to eliminate the Farm Security Administration from handling the matter that a number of Representatives came and testified before our committee. One of them specifically pointed out that he did not want to see men leave the Farm Security Administration, as that organization had been eliminated in the House joint resolution, put on different hats and come in and do the same work under some other organization. When Mr. Davis came before our committee, I pointed out to him that that was the definite view of the House, as I understood it, and Mr. Davis said he had the same understanding. I told him that was also my view, and, so far as I could judge the temper of several members of the committee, that it was also their view. But Mr. Davis pointed out to us that we are late at this hour in getting at this problem of recruiting the farm labor.

Mr. President, the sad part of the situation is, as I see it now, that in laying the strategy of our war effort, food has not been properly represented at the council table. It has been testified before our committee that to meet the requirements of this Nation and its commitments at the present time, and to provide for emergencies which are foreseeable, we will be required to produce at least 8 percent more food than we did last year. But the best information we can get from the county agents throughout the Nation is that we will fall short anywhere from 1 percent to 30 percent of the production we had last year. If we fall short even 15 percent of last year's production, and if we fail to obtain the 8-percent increase which we are told we must have, as the whole strategy of America's participation in the war is based upon at least a 25-percent shortage in food production in the coming year, anything which now retards that production is dangerous.

That was why Mr. Davis said to the committee that, although he did not want to create another bureau, he felt he should have a rather free hand in moving as rapidly as he could move to meet this problem. Since he is to be the one to direct the effort to meet it, I am basing my judgment upon his testimony, because he said he felt that the extension services were the proper ones to ascertain the need within the counties, to accept the labor which came to the counties, and to place it within the counties, but that he might have to use any number of other agencies, and he did not wish to exclude entirely even Farm Security, which I would have been willing to exclude permanently but for the lateness of this hour. Food is going to be the bottleneck of this war, and it will be the breaking point of the war unless we do everything we can to produce it now.

For that reason I believe we should give Mr. Davis the opportunity to move forward, using his knowledge that it is the will of Congress—and certainly he knows from the discussion had today in the Senate, from the House bill, and from our discussion with him in the committee that it is the will of Congress—that he do not put the Farm Security back in command in any real degree of this problem.

Again I say that because food has not been properly represented at the council table in the consideration of the over-all problem of America's participation in this global war, we should give Mr. Davis a chance at this late hour to move as quickly as he can move. I think the whole situation was changed when Mr. Davis came in. He came in late, but I think we should afford him the opportunity to proceed, and then hold him responsible, he having been told what the will of Congress is in the matter.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, yesterday nearly every State was represented by its director of the Selective Service System at a meeting held in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building. Other officers of the Selective Service System were present; so the gathering included approximately 75 persons. The unanimous evidence relating to the par-

ticular subject now under discussion was that there has been a marked migration of men between the ages of 18 and 38 from nonessential occupations to the farms, whether they were in one or another classification of deferment, all of them being within the class of those who, under the existing orders of the Selective Service System and under the possible law, might be called into service.

That proves two things. First, it proves that the need is being to some extent relieved; secondly, it proves the all-significant fact that it was the compulsion of liability which caused this movement of marked proportions during the last 30 days, and especially marked during the last 10 days. The opportunity to learn these facts came to us yesterday by chance.

Mr. President, in order for men between the ages of 18 and 38 to come under the protecting shield of occupational deferment, there is no need for those of them who are engaged in occupations essential to the war effort to go back to the farms. They can remain where they are, and can serve their country in skilled activities, even though they are skilled farmers, too; and at the same time they can draw much higher wages than those they could receive on the farms, and can enjoy a much more glamorous life.

So there is no exodus from essential occupations back to the farms. Why is that so? Because there is no compulsion or liability which causes them to go back to the farms.

Mr. President, I beg of you not to consider me as being cynical about this matter. I am trying to present some cold facts for the consideration of the Senate at this moment.

Aside from considering the experience as to the group of men between the ages of 18 and 38 as to whom exists the liability for service at the front, where there is danger of being shot, let us consider what has been the experience with the other groups, as shown by the evidence which, since October 1942, has been in process of being taken. We can talk all we please about "recruiting," but that is the wrong word. We cannot recruit those men. The proper word is "shifting."

Even under the work-or-fight order under which a certain degree of sanction or coercion exists, to be applied indirectly, how does the measure attempt to shift work? Mr. President, the first area which was organized was the Baltimore area. There is where the longest experience has been had. The evidence shows the following with respect to the shifting; and if this is not striking evidence of the fact that men do not move by being requested to move, then I do not know what evidence is:

The record of the attempts of the United States Employment Service to get these men—

That is, men who were in nonessenial occupations—

to take vital jobs was poor. The United States Employment Service took 96,938 talent questionnaires from the Army in July, but its staff was too small to analyze that number. It analyzed about 20,000 cases. Of these, 2,734 of the best qualified were called in for interview and selection. The best 1,123 were then offered the 1,123 jobs then available. Acceptance was voluntary and depended on the amount of interest shown both by employer and by candidate. If the man did not like the looks of the job, that ended it. Only 49 of the 1,123 men, about 1 in 25, were sufficiently interested to go to see the employer. Of these 49, 4 failed to report, and 4 more refused the employer's offer. This left only 41, some of whom dropped out later. There were only 26 verified placements.

The country needed 1,123 workers in vital war jobs from Baltimore just then and could get only 26, or about 2 percent of the qualified 1,123.

Mr. President, that survey was made by Market Analysis, Inc. The statistical data and other detailed information found in the pamphlet have been obtained from the following sources:

The War Manpower Commission and the various agencies included in the Baltimore office of the Commission.

The United States Employment Service.

The War Production Board.

The Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

The local State and city departments of education and welfare.

The Urban League.

The Fair Rent Commission of Baltimore.

It was edited by Sanford Griffith, who is probably well known to many of us.

Mr. President, I make this point because it seems to me that great as is the need of agriculture, and imminent as it is, the problem cannot be solved by merely appropriating money and declaring that it may be used for the purpose of recruiting and moving labor, paying for its transportation, and providing this and that, to shift men from New York City to some other place.

The effort to shift men, without any statutory liability on their part to go, was an abominable failure in the last war. Armed guards had to be put on the trains to keep from leaving men who had originally agreed to go, and who, while on their journey, became determined to get off the train at intermediate stations because they were sick of the idea of being transported so far. Without general liability to work, and without any way to mobilize the workers, I believe it would be utterly futile to appropriate great sums of money with the objective of inducing them to go.

Mr. President, let me make one further comment. I am not making a "plug" for Senate bill 666. What I have to say has to do with reference to the pending joint resolution. An attempt has been made in the latter part of the debate to shift the emphasis from the importation of foreign labor to the other element of the joint resolution, namely, the transfer of domestic labor. After only a brief study of the joint resolution and only this opportunity of hearing my colleagues talk about it, yet having listened with great care and study, it seems to me that the one element which calls for speed and requires immediate action is the element of immigration. If it be true, Mr. President, that the need for labor is in sowing the crops, then we probably cannot wait until we shall have handled the manpower question in a general way. It is probably true that we would have to import labor for that purpose at this time. Let me ask Senators who have been advocating this measure whether men are really needed to plant the crops, or whether the need is for confidence on the part of the farmer that when his crop grows he will have the labor to harvest it. Is not that the only question? If it is, there is no need to enact such a futile law as this would be, for, by that time we can provide domestic labor for the job of harvesting.

The evidence already taken shows that we have the labor in this country. The difficulty is that it is in pools here and there. There are critical areas of shortage of manpower in various places, and there are other areas where there is a surplus, where men are idle. Under existing law, even with the power of an order of the Chief Executive to work or fight, we cannot mobilize those men, because they will not go. They will not be moved. They do not recognize any liability resting on them to volunteer to go; and until the Congress declares a liability, which is supposed to be equal upon all mobile persons in this country, and makes all citizens equally liable to contribute to the war effort, this condition will continue and we shall have bill after bill presented to the Congress to try to solve it piecemeal, a little bit here and a little bit there, without any satisfactory result.

Mr. President, I hope that the joint resolution may be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to ascertain the fundamental facts. Is there need for men to plant the crops, or is this a problem of having men ready to harvest the crops, or of enacting legislation which will give the farmer confidence that if he increases the amount of his plantings which will be harvested in the fall he will then have the labor to harvest the crops? If the Secretary of Agriculture finds that to be the condition, then let us not pass this kind of piecemeal legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is any prospect of obtaining a vote on the joint resolution immediately, I hope we may proceed to vote upon it. Before the Senate adjourns I desire very briefly to make some observations concerning the remarks made earlier in the day by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], but I do not wish to interfere with the consideration of the joint resolution if there is any prospect of obtaining a vote on it immediately. Why can we not vote on it now?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to refer the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The motion was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I note the absence of the sponsor of the motion to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. LODGE]. I am very sorry that action was taken on the motion before he could reach the Chamber.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator from Massachusetts left the Chamber he told me that he had an imperative engagement with General Marshall, and would be called away. He asked me to register him in favor of his motion. Beyond that, I have no instructions from him.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was absent from the Chamber for a few minutes. I knew that the Senator from Massachusetts had an appointment, but I thought he had canceled it. I did not want to have action taken in the way in which it was taken if the Senator from Massachusetts could reach the Chamber in a short time. Because of the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts, I was about to ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the motion was rejected; but in view of the statement of the Senator from Michigan I have nothing further to say.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, has the joint resolution been read the third time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution has been read the third time.

Mr. McNARY. Earlier in the day the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] advised me that he desired to move to strike out section 4. I notice that he is absent from the Chamber. In order to protect his rights, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, did the Senator from Oregon refer to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]?

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Wyoming told me that he was compelled to go to the War Department to keep an appointment there. He said that he hoped to be able to return before the joint resolution was finally acted upon, but that if he did not, he necessarily could not offer his amendment, being at the War Department.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, again the matter has been explained away.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon insist on his point of no quorum?

Mr. McNARY. In view of the statement of the Senator from Georgia I do not insist on it. I merely wish to protect the rights of absent Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, before the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] left the Chamber he stated to me that he desired to offer an amendment, and that if he did not return in time, he wished me to offer it in his behalf.

On behalf of the Senator from Wyoming I move to amend the joint resolution by striking out all of section 4, beginning with line 10, on page 10, and extending through line 16 on page 11.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The joint resolution having been read the third time, is it not too late to offer an amendment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is correct. The amendment could be offered only by unanimous consent.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the rule should be observed. I object to the consideration of amendments after the third reading of the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, ask for a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 635.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 635) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to taking up Senate bill 635. Earlier in the day I spoke with the eminent Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD,] and I believe it was agreed that if we reached this period in the afternoon the request might be made, but the bill would then go over until the first of next week. I do not desire to object to the consideration of the bill today. I believe also that the distinguished leader of the majority [Mr. BARKLEY] would like to have the bill go over until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, it had been my hope to dispose of the bill today and then adjourn until Monday; but if we cannot dispose of it today, if it is agreeable to the Senator in charge of the bill, it will be entirely agreeable to me to make it the unfinished business and let it go over until Monday.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it is perfectly agreeable to me to have the bill go over until Monday, except that I am informed that the chairman of the Civil Service Committee [Mr. DOWNEY] will be out of the city on an important committee assignment on Monday. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who has had a great deal to do with the formation of the bill, will likewise be out of the city on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suppose that under the circumstances the Senate will have to accommodate itself to the convenience of absent Senators instead of transacting business here where we were sent to transact it. I suppose we should recess from time to time until all Senators return to Washington so that business can then be transacted by the Senate. I do not say that in any critical spirit with respect to the two Senators who have been mentioned; but during this session Senators have been absent on one mission or another all over the United States, if not all over the world. They are everywhere except in the Senate, where they were chosen to serve.

I hope that we can transact the business of the Senate without having to adjourn from day to day because Senators desire to be absent. It is immaterial to me whether the bill is taken up tomorrow. I am perfectly willing to move a recess and have a session of the Senate tomorrow if we can dispose of the bill. Otherwise, let it go over until Monday. If we are to adjourn from today until Monday next, we must have some business to transact on Monday. It is not convenient to meet on Tuesday, because it is planned to hold a ceremony dedicating the Jefferson Memorial in Potomac Park. For that reason we are not contemplating a meeting on Tuesday next, so I hope that Senators will be able to accommodate their individual situations to the necessities of the Senate.

There is a great deal of criticism throughout the country because of absenteeism in factories and war plants. The first thing we know criticism will be centered on the Senate; and it may not be inappropriate when it comes.

I notice that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is looking at me intently. The situation is becoming such that I cannot look at a Senator when I

April 9

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD].

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER]?

There was no objection.

TAX BILL

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, a day or so after the Carlson amendment was defeated last week the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], issued a statement that has been well received by the press, the businessmen, and the wage earners of this country. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], speaking for the majority charged with the responsibility of enacting a workable tax-collection bill, took the position that a tax bill should be introduced providing for the collection of taxes at the source, and almost without exception all classes of people are in agreement on this proposition.

The minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], yesterday made the suggestion that some brief, concise, and workable bill be reported to the House before the adjournment on April 17. These expressions from both sides of the aisle show very clearly that there is no insurmountable obstacle in the way of the adoption of an orderly, efficient tax-collection system that will put an end to the present uncertainty.

What the country is demanding, in my judgment, is a tax bill that will get results, and get them now. It could well go into effect after the second quarterly payment on June 15, and whatever forgiveness of taxes might be involved would be a good investment in the bringing of our tax collections to a current basis. Unless we are prepared to sacrifice billions in revenue from persons who are receiving extraordinarily high incomes, we must go on a current basis, and we cannot go on such a basis without forgiving some taxes—at least, to some degree. Those who fear that war millionaires will be created overnight can banish their fears; for, in the first place, a bill which would become effective for the last half of the year would materially cut the amount of taxes which would be abated; and, furthermore, the able members of the Ways and Means Committee can easily and quickly frame a bill that will take care of this objection.

In view of the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], as well as the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] yesterday, it is to be hoped that a practical, workable bill can be reported and passed before we leave Washington on April 17.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include copy of the President's Executive order of last night in regard to stabilization of prices and wages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PACE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

REMEMBER BATAAN

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FISH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner of April 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an address delivered by the Reverend Father Edmund Walsh.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

(Mr. FULMER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BUSBEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOBBS BILL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the procession of converts to some sort of a pay-as-you-earn tax plan which has been hitting the sawdust trail down here to the well of the House would be encouraging to any evangelist. What I am wondering is whether when some sort of a pay-as-you-earn tax plan comes up for consideration those who favor it will be told from the floor of the House that if they vote for such a scheme they are scoundrels or fools.

The little zephyr of public condemnation that has hit this House because of its refusal to adopt some such plan is going to be nothing compared to the tornado of public indignation that will hit us if we try to fool the people with a Hobbs bill that does not reach the evil the people want corrected. I mean the end of violence, union raiding, extortion, and forced payment of dues and initiation fees. When the Hobbs bill comes on for consideration, you watch it, because some labor leaders and some others who want to compromise so as to permit racketeering are going to threaten us with political execution if we pass a bill which will give union men, as well as the public, real protection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some statistics and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two topics; in one, to include a couple of memorials adopted by the Washington State Legis-

lature, and in the other, to include a set of tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief statement by General MacArthur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

A DANGEROUS ATTACK ON ONE OF OUR ALLIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker I cannot refrain from replying to what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] just said. David Dubinsky is not a Communist. He has been one of the most earnest and effective opponents of communism in the whole American labor movement for years and years and years. Personally I think that discussion in the House of what happens in Russia as to the execution of these two men is not going to gain anything but in the interest of fairness I myself inserted the speech of Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, delivered at that same meeting. I do not see how anyone can take exception to the temperate remarks which Mr. Green made in which he protested the execution of these two men who for years he says have been known as earnest leaders of the labor movement in Poland, who were not Communists in any sense or definition of that term, but whose public record for a long period of time has been a record in vigorous opposition to nazi-ism and Hitlerism, and all that those things stand for. These men were Poles, they were labor leaders, they were Jews. They were sought and pursued by the Gestapo. That they could have been guilty of trying to aid Hitler's cause appears to me utterly inconceivable.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. [During count.] Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then I make it, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 49]

Anderson, Calif.	Hartley	Pfeifer
Bates, Ky.	Holmes, Mass.	Plumley
Bates, Mass.	Horan	Pracht
Bell	Izac	Richards
Boykin	Johnson, Calvin D.	Robinson, Utah
Brooks	Kee	Rohrbough
Burdick	Keefe	Sabath
Byrne	Kerr	Scanlon
Cannon, Fla.	Knutson	Schiffler
Carson, Ohio	Lewis, Colo.	Short
Cooley	Luce	Smith, Maine
Cox	McGranery	Smith, Va.
Culkin	McKenzie	Somers, N. Y.
Cullen	Maas	Sparkman
Dawson	Mansfield, Tex.	Starnes, Ala.
Dickstein	Mason	Stevenson
Dingell	Monkiewicz	Thomason
Elliott	Morrison, La.	Tolan
Fogarty	Morrison, N. C.	Treadway
Gibson	Mott	Wadsworth
Gordon	Nichols	Weaver
Gore	O'Brien, Ill.	Wilson
Gorski	O'Hara	Winter
Guyer	O'Toole	
Hagen	Outland	
Hall, Leonard W.	Patman	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings, under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 96, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TARVER, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. WENE, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DITTER, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. PLUMLEY.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations known as the Kerr committee, may have permission to sit during the session of the House today until 3 o'clock this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may sit during the session of the House today until 3 o'clock this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What is the committee considering?

Mr. MAY. We are considering a batch of bills relating to manpower and several other problems.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial appearing in The Tablet, a Catholic weekly of Brooklyn, N. Y., Saturday, April 3, 1943, entitled "Freedom for All."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of yesterday, on page 3167 I am credited with making some remarks in favor of a certain amendment then pending and with stating that I was a lawyer. The reporter evidently confused me with someone else. I did not make the remarks. I am not a lawyer; and while the amendment doubtless had merit, I did not favor its adoption at this time and voted against it as is shown by the later roll call. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD may be corrected accordingly and the remarks properly credited to whomever may have made them.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected in accordance with the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota.

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ANTI-RACKETEERING ACT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is further consideration of House Resolution 154.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Michigan to yield some time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I suggest that while I am very happy to have such a fine crowd in attendance, I had nothing to do with bringing Members over here.

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 96

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 9, 1943

Ordered to be printed with the amendment of the Senate

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

~~That for expenses necessary for the recruiting, training, and placement of workers needed for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war (including agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States); to be expended under the supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agricultural extension services of the~~

~~land-grant colleges in the respective States on the basis of existing cooperative agreements between the Department and the land-grant colleges as to the conduct of extension work and apportioned to the States on the basis of need for the purposes specified herein; for transportation and subsistence of workers and expenditures for construction, rental, or operation of temporary suitable housing or shelter facilities for such workers where existing housing facilities are not adequate (including for the purposes specified herein, agricultural workers who are imported into the United States from foreign countries and aliens interned in the United States), to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Agricultural Extension Service in cooperation with the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States, as hereinbefore specified, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $26,100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943, of which not less than $100,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of Extension, and not less than $13,500,000 shall be apportioned to the extension services in the States on the basis of need to enable them to carry out their responsibilities hereunder within the States, including the recruiting, training, and placement of farm labor, the provision, operation,~~

~~and supervision of temporary housing and shelter facilities and the transportation, supervision, temporary subsistence, and protection of workers within the States as herein provided; the remaining funds not to exceed $12,500,000 to be available as provided herein to carry out cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service for recruiting and transporting domestic workers from State to State, and imported workers, including the payment of necessary transportation, subsistence, temporary housing, and protection of such workers while en route, and including also such funds as may be necessary to be apportioned temporarily by the Federal Office of Extension to the Farm Security Administration for the importation of workers from Mexico until such time as appropriate modifications in the existing agreement between the Governments of Mexico and of the United States with respect to the importation of agricultural workers into the United States from Mexico can be renegotiated in line with the provisions of this Act, but not to exceed a period of thirty days after the enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That the Office of Extension Service in the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the State extension services in the States which are concerned in obtaining such labor are authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States Employment Service to recruit and transport such domestic~~

1 ~~and imported labor to and from the respective States and~~
2 ~~the extension services in the States either individually or~~
3 ~~collectively may enter into such agreements with the United~~
4 ~~States Employment Service to recruit and transport such~~
5 ~~labor, subject to general rules and regulations to be issued~~
6 ~~by the Federal Office of the Extension Service and the~~
7 ~~United States Employment Services: *Provided further,*~~
8 ~~That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be ex-~~
9 ~~pended for the transportation of any worker from the~~
10 ~~county where he resides or is working to a place of employ-~~
11 ~~ment outside of such county without the prior consent in~~
12 ~~writing of the county extension agent of such county, or for~~
13 ~~the transportation of any worker outside the limits of the~~
14 ~~State where he resides or is working without the prior con-~~
15 ~~sent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture for such~~
16 ~~State or other official who performs similar functions for such~~
17 ~~State: *Provided further,* That the extension services of the~~
18 ~~land-grant colleges shall be responsible for the recruiting,~~
19 ~~training, transportation, and placement of all such workers~~
20 ~~within their respective States; and the Extension Service is~~
21 ~~authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated~~
22 ~~services and to cooperate with any other public or private~~
23 ~~agency: *Provided further,* That existing farm labor camps~~
24 ~~and other necessary housing or shelter facilities now owned or~~
25 ~~hereafter acquired by the United States Department of Agri-~~

~~culture and former Civilian Conservation Corps camps where suitably located shall be made available to such workers to the extent they are required and shall be operated under the supervision of the Extension Service as hereinbefore provided so long as such facilities are required for this purpose: *Provided further,* That expenditures may be made hereunder without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes: *Provided further,* That any payments made by the United States or private employers to aliens brought in under this program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code: *Provided further,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of section 3 (f), 7 (c), and 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act: *Provided further,* That the terms "States" or "State" as used herein include Puerto Rico and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.~~

1 *That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money*
2 *in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of*
3 *$40,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943,*
4 *to be expended under the direction and supervision of the*
5 *Administrator of Food Production and Distribution (here-*
6 *inafter referred to as the "Administrator"), appointed pur-*
7 *suant to Executive Order Numbered 9322, dated March 26,*
8 *1943, for assisting in providing an adequate supply of*
9 *workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural*
10 *commodities essential to the prosecution of the war.*

11 PAYMENTS TO STATES

12 *SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of assisting in providing an*
13 *adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting*
14 *of agricultural commodities within the several States, the*
15 *Administrator shall apportion among the several States, on*
16 *the basis of need, not less than $13,500,000 and not more*
17 *than $20,000000 of the sum appropriated by section 1 and*
18 *the sums so apportioned shall be available for payment to*
19 *such States for expenditure by the agricultural extension*
20 *services in such States, the administration of which*
21 *funds shall be subject to the supervision and approval of*
22 *the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may*
23 *be expended by such extension services shall include, among*
24 *other things, (1) the recruiting, placement (including the*

1 *placement of workers as tenants or sharecroppers), and*
2 *training of such workers; (2) transportation, supervision,*
3 *subsistence, protection, health and medical and burial services,*
4 *and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary*
5 *personal property; (3) lease, repair, alteration, and opera-*
6 *tion of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and*
7 *services, including former Civilian Conservation Corps*
8 *camps; (4) advancing to workers of sums due from em-*
9 *ployers within the United States who are under contractual*
10 *obligation to reimburse such extension services for such ad-*
11 *vances; (5) employment of personnel and other adminis-*
12 *trative expenses; and (6) payment to or reimbursement of*
13 *other public or private agencies or individuals for furnishing*
14 *services or facilities for such purposes. Such extension*
15 *services may enter into agreements with other public and*
16 *private agencies and individuals and utilize the facilities and*
17 *services of such agencies and individuals in carrying out*
18 *the purposes of this section.*
19 *(b) The Administrator shall certify to the Secretary of*
20 *the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts to be paid to*
21 *each State under this section and the time or times such*
22 *amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury*
23 *shall pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the*
24 *Administrator, the amounts so certified.*

1 *EXPENDITURE OF OTHER FUNDS*

2 *SEC. 3. (a) Not more than $20,000,000 of the funds*
3 *appropriated by section 1 and not apportioned by the Ad-*
4 *ministrator among the several States pursuant to section 2*
5 *shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator. The*
6 *purposes for which such funds may be expended shall include,*
7 *among other things, (1) the recruiting, placement (including*
8 *the placement of workers as tenants or sharecroppers), and*
9 *transportation of workers and their families and necessary*
10 *personal property, within the United States and elsewhere;*
11 *(2) furnishing, by loans, grants, or otherwise, of health and*
12 *medical and burial services, training, subsistence, allowances,*
13 *protection, and shelter for such workers and their families;*
14 *(3) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within*
15 *the United States who are under contractual obligation to*
16 *reimburse the United States for such advances; (4) lease,*
17 *repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and*
18 *other necessary facilities and services; and (5) operating*
19 *personnel and expenses to carry out the above purposes.*
20 *Sums collected by way of reimbursement for advances made*
21 *under the authority of this subsection shall be deposited to this*
22 *appropriation, or to appropriations for similar purposes*
23 *available when reimbursement is received, and such deposits*
24 *shall be available for the purposes of the appropriation.*

25 *(b) Not more than 2 per centum of the funds appro-*

1 *priated by section 1 hereof shall be available for adminis-*
2 *trative expenses of the Administrator, including (1) the em-*
3 *ployment of persons and organizations, by contract or other-*
4 *wise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (2) purchase,*
5 *exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying*
6 *vehicles; (3) printing and binding; (4) travel expenses of*
7 *persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facili-*
8 *tating capacities within a foreign country or from a foreign*
9 *country to the United States and return, including such*
10 *expenses to first-duty stations; and (5) payment to or reim-*
11 *bursement of other agencies or individuals for administrative*
12 *expenses incurred by them.*

13 *(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution, the Ad-*
14 *ministrator is authorized—*

15 *(1) to utilize the facilities, services, and personnel*
16 *of units and agencies within the Department of Agricul-*
17 *ture; to enter into agreements with other public or pri-*
18 *vate agencies or individuals; to utilize (pursuant to such*
19 *agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies*
20 *and individuals and to delegate to them functions under*
21 *this joint resolution; and to allocate or transfer funds to*
22 *(in addition to the transfers authorized by the Depart-*
23 *ment of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal*
24 *years 1943 and 1944), or otherwise to pay or reimburse*

1 *such units, agencies, and individuals for expenses in*
2 *connection therewith;*
3 *(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncom-*
4 *pensated services; and*
5 *(3) to cooperate with the Secretary of State in the*
6 *negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign*
7 *governments relating to the importation of workers into*
8 *the United States.*

9 *LIMITATIONS*

10 *SEC. 4. (a) No part of the funds herein appropriated*
11 *shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from*
12 *the county where he resides or is working to a place of em-*
13 *ployment outside of such county without the prior consent in*
14 *writing of the county extension agent of such county, if such*
15 *worker has resided in such county for a period of one year*
16 *or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in*
17 *agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such*
18 *period: Provided, That upon the refusal of the county ex-*
19 *tension agent to give his consent in any such case, any inter-*
20 *ested or affected person may appeal to the Administrator, and*
21 *the Administrator may permit the expenditure of such funds*
22 *for the transportation of such worker from such county if the*
23 *Administrator finds that the services of such worker can be*
24 *more effectively utilized at another place of employment.*
25 *(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or here-*

tofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country: Provided, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be expended without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) Any payments made by the United States or other public or private agencies or employers to aliens brought into the United States under this joint resolution shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. Aliens brought into the

1 *United States under this joint resolution shall be exempt*
2 *from the payment of the head tax required by section 2*
3 *of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other*
4 *admission charges.*

5 *(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution—*

6 *(1) the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and*
7 *Puerto Rico;*

8 *(2) the term "worker" includes nationals of the*
9 *United States and aliens;*

10 *(3) the term "agricultural labor" includes any*
11 *services or activities included within the provisions of*
12 *section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938*
13 *or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code.*

14 *(d) Effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3*
15 *of the Act of June 29, 1936 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 433),*
16 *receipts derived for the account of the United States from*
17 *the use and occupancy of agricultural labor supply centers,*
18 *including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under*
19 *the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be*
20 *deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.*

21 *(e) The former Civilian Conservation Corps camps*
22 *shall be transferred without charge to the Administrator, to*
23 *the extent that he deems necessary to carry out the purposes*
24 *of this joint resolution: Provided, That no such camp which*
25 *is being utilized by any other agency of the Government, or*

1 *which has been transferred to any State, county, municipality,*
2 *or nonprofit organization, shall be transferred to the Admin-*
3 *istrator under this subsection without the consent of such*
4 *agency, State, county, municipality, or organization.*
5 *(f) For the purposes of title I of the Social Security*
6 *Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age*
7 *assistance), and appropriations heretofore or hereafter made*
8 *to carry out the purposes of such title, no person shall be*
9 *deemed not to be a needy individual by reason of remunera-*
10 *tion paid to such person for any agricultural labor performed*
11 *by him during the period beginning with the date of enact-*
12 *ment of this joint resolution and ending six months after the*
13 *termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by*
14 *the President. The Federal Security Administrator shall*
15 *promptly notify each State that grants under such title will be*
16 *available for the payment of old-age assistance with respect*
17 *to any person without regard to the remuneration received by*
18 *such person for agricultural labor performed by him during*
19 *such period; and no State shall be required, in determining*
20 *need in the case of any individual, to take into consideration*
21 *any income or resources derived by him from such agricul-*
22 *tural labor: Provided, That this subsection (f) shall not be*
23 *construed to alter or amend any provision of existing law*
24 *save that during the time mentioned any person receiving*
25 *old-age assistance shall be entitled to receive remuneration*

1 *for agricultural labor performed without in any way what-*
2 *ever altering, changing or modifying his or her status as*
3 *recipients of old-age assistance.*

Passed the House of Representatives March 17, 1943.

Attest: SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with an amendment April 8 (legislative day, April 6), 1943.

Attest: EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary.

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 96

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 9, 1943

Ordered to be printed with the amendment of the Senate

April 19

by Public Law No. 23, approved April 8, 1943.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made this afternoon certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a summary of the testimony before the House Committee on Small Business today on the price of oil.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Oil City Derrick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report and statement on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96), making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $26,100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943, to be expended by the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator'), appointed pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 9322, dated March 26, 1943, for assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, as follows.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities within the several States, the Administrator shall apportion among the several States, on the basis of need, not less than $9,000,000 and not more than $13,050,000 of the sum appropriated by section 1 and the sums so apportioned shall be available for payment to such States for expenditure by the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in such States in accordance with such agreements as may be entered into by the Administrator and such extension services and subject to the supervision of the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may be expended by such extension services shall include, among other things, (1) the recruiting, placement (including the placement of workers as tenants or sharecroppers), and training of such workers; (2) transportation, supervision subsistence, protection, health, and medical and burial services, and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary personal property; (3) lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services, including former Civilian Conservation Corps camps; (4) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within the United States who are under contractual obligation to reimburse such extension services for such advances; (5) employment of personnel and other administrative expenses; and (6) payment to or reimbursement of other public or private agencies or individuals for furnishing services or facilities for such purposes. Such extension services may enter into agreements with other public and private agencies and individuals and utilize the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals in carrying out the purposes of this section.

"(b) The Administrator shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts to be paid to each State under this section and the time or times such amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Administrator, the amounts so certified.

"EXPENDITURE OF OTHER FUNDS

"SEC. 3. (a) Not more than $13,050,000 of the funds appropriated by section 1 and not apportioned by the Administrator among the several States pursuant to section 2 shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may be expended shall include, among other things, (1) the recruiting and transportation of workers and their families and necessary personal property, within the United States and elsewhere; (2) furnishing, by loans or otherwise, of health and medical and burial services, training, subsistence, allowances, protection, and shelter for such workers and their families; (3) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within the United States who are under contractual obligation to reimburse the United States for such advances; (4) lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services; and (5) operating personnel and expenses to carry out the above purposes.

"(b) Not more than 2 per centum of the funds appropriated by section 1 hereof shall be available for administrative expenses of the Administrator, including (1) the employment of persons and organizations, by contract or otherwise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (2) purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; (3) printing and binding; (4) travel expenses of persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating capacities within a foreign country or from a foreign country to the United States and return, including such expenses as first-duty stations; and (5) payment to or reimbursement of other agencies or individuals for administrative expenses incurred by them.

"(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution, the Administrator is authorized—

"(1) to utilize the facilities, services, and personnel of units and agencies within the Department of Agriculture; to enter into agreements with other public or private agencies or individuals; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals and to delegate to them functions under this joint resolution; and to allocate or transfer funds to (in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944), or otherwise to pay or reimburse such units, agencies, and individuals for expenses in connection therewith;

"(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

"(3) to cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign governments relating to the importation of workers into the United States.

"LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 4. (a) No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, if such worker has resided in such county for a period of one year or more immediately prior

thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period.

"(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or heretofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

"MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 5. (a) Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be expended without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"(b) Any payments made by the United States or other public or private agencies or employers to aliens brought into the United States under this joint resolution shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution—

"(1) the term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico;

"(2) the term 'worker' includes nationals of the United States and aliens;

"(3) the term 'agricultural labor' includes any services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(d) Effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3 of the Act of June 29, 1936 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 433), receipts derived for the account of the United States from the use and occupancy of agricultural labor supply centers, including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(e) The former Civilian Conservation Corps camps shall be transferred without charge to the Administrator, to the extent that he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution: *Provided*, That no such camp which is being utilized by any other agency of the Government, or which has been transferred to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization, shall be transferred to the Administrator under this subsection without the consent of such agency, State, county, municipality, or organization.

"(f) Notwithstanding provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of April 1943, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual arising from agricultural labor performed by him as an employee, or from labor otherwise performed by him in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities, after the date of enactment of this joint resolution and prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

"(g) In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident desiring to enter the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by Section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges, and shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of Section 3 of such Act which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage by corporations, foreign government, or others; and any such resident shall be admitted to perform agricultural labor in the United States for such time and under such conditions (but not including the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States) as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General; and in the event such regulations require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident which he is unable to furnish, such requirement may be waived by the admitting officer of the United States at the point where such resident seeks entry into the United States if such official has other proof satisfactory to him that such resident is a native of the country claimed as his birthplace. Each such resident shall be provided with an identification card (with his photograph and fingerprints) to be prescribed under such regulations which shall be in lieu of all other documentary requirements, including the registration at time of entry or after entry required by the Alien Registration Act of 1940. Any such resident admitted under the foregoing provisions who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission shall be taken into custody under a warrant issued by the Attorney General at any time after entry and deported in accordance with Section 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917. Sections 5 and 6 of such Act shall not apply to the importation of aliens under this joint resolution. No provision of this joint resolution shall authorize the admission into the United States of any enemy alien."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
M. C. TARVER,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
ELMER H. WENE,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment.

The House measure appropriates a total of $26,100,000 for the farm labor program to be expended under the direction and supervision of the United States Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture, and the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in the several States. Of this sum, $100,000 is earmarked for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of Extension, not less than $13,500,000 for apportionment to the extension services of the States for the farm labor program within the States, and not to exceed $12,500,000 for use cooperatively by the Federal Office of Extension, the State extension services, and the United States Employment Service in connection with interstate and imported farm labor.

The Senate amendment provides a total appropriation of $40,000,000 to be expended under the supervision and direction of the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution appointed pursuant to the Executive order of March 26, 1943, of which not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000 is for apportionment to the several States for use by the extension services for agricultural labor within the States, and not more than $20,000,000 is made available for expenditure by the administrator for recruiting, transporting, and placing farm labor within the United States, and elsewhere. In connection with the latter sum, the administrator is authorized to utilize facilities, services, and personnel within the Department of Agriculture and to enter into agreements with other public or private agencies, or individuals, and to utilize their facilities, and services.

The conference agreement retains the House amount of $26,100,000 to be expended "by" the Administrator instead of "under his direction and supervision," as proposed by the Senate for the purposes and in the manner set forth in the resolution, and instead of under the direction and supervision of the United States Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges as provided in the House measure.

The conference agreement retains the Senate provision with respect to allocations to the States for expenditure by the State extension services for workers within the States, fixing the sum to be so apportioned at not less than $9,000,000 and not more than $13,050,000 instead of not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000 as provided by the Senate, and not less than $13,500,000, as provided by the House.

The conference agreement retains the Senate provision for the expenditure of a portion of the appropriation by the Administrator reducing the amount from not to exceed $20,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, to not to exceed $13,050,000, and eliminates the provision in the House measure for the expenditure of not to exceed $12,500,000 by cooperative agreement of the Federal Office of Extension, the State extension services, and the United States Employment Service with respect to interstate and imported labor. The Senate provision is further modified by eliminating authority for the making of grants, the use of repayments of money advances as a credit to the appropriation, and the placement of workers.

The Senate amendment contains a provision similar to that in the House measure with respect to the transportation of workers out of a county without prior consent of the county extension agent. It differs from the House provision in that it does not require

consent of the State commissioner of agriculture in the case of transportation of agricultural labor out of the State. The Senate amendment places a requirement of 1 year's prior residence and engagement in agricultural labor as a requisite to the applicability of the provision and further stipulates that an appeal may be taken to the Administrator from the action of the county agent in refusing transportation to such worker. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision eliminating therefrom the appellate feature.

The Senate amendment contains a provision similar to that in the House measure prohibiting the use of the funds to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership in connection with agricultural labor. The Senate amendment differs from the House measure in that it excepts from the provision imported workers to the extent required to comply with agreements with foreign governments, and also permits the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural labor which may provide that prevailing wages shall be paid for particular crops and areas and that shelter shall be provided for such labor. The conference agreement adopts the Senate language.

The Senate amendment and the House measure contain provisions with respect to expenditure of the funds without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (competitive bidding) and the exemption from the withholding or deduction provisions of section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code in connection with payments to aliens brought in under the joint resolution. The conference agreement retains these provisions.

The Senate amendment contains provisions for covering into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, effective July 1, 1943, the revenues to be obtained from use and occupancy of agricultural labor supply centers. In the absence of such provision such revenues would be available for reexpenditure. The House measure contained no comparable requirement. The conference agreement adopts the Senate language.

The Senate amendment and the House measure contain similar provisions with respect to the use of Civilian Conservation Corps camps for farm labor shelter. The Senate language, however, provides that any camp being utilized by any other agency of the Government or which has been transferred to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization shall not be transferred for use under the joint resolution without the consent of the agency or organization utilizing it. The conference agreement accepts the Senate modification.

The House measure placed no limit upon the amount of the appropriation that could be used for administrative expenses except in the case of the allocation of $100,000 to the Federal Office of Extension. The Senate amendment prescribes that not more than 2 percent of the appropriation may be used for administrative expenses of the Administrator and sets forth the major categories of such expense. The conference agreement adopts the Senate recommendation.

The Senate amendment (sec. 5f) contains provisions designed to permit recipients of old-age assistance under the Social Security Act to work as agricultural workers during the continuance of the hostilities in the present war, and for 6 months thereafter, without having such assistance discontinued or reduced. The House measure contained no corresponding provisions. The conference agreement retains these provisions in amended form. Title I of the Social Security Act now provides for grants-in-aid to the States for old-age assistance, and provides that such grants will be made only with respect to assistance for needy individuals. This means that if any recipient of old-age assistance should earn money for working on a farm, his old-age assistance might be reduced or discontinued on the ground that his need was less or no longer existed. The provisions in the conference agreement will enable the States, if they so desire, to continue to pay old-age assistance at the present rates to persons who are receiving such assistance at the present time, notwithstanding the fact that such persons earn income as agricultural workers during the continuance of hostilities in the present war and the succeeding 6 months; and the Federal grants-in-aid with respect to such assistance will continue to be made without regard to the fact that the States in such cases do not take such income into consideration for the purpose of determining the need of such persons for old-age assistance.

The Senate amendment (sec. 5b) provides that aliens brought into the United States under the joint resolution shall be exempt from the payment of head-tax required by section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges. The House measure contains no corresponding provision. The conference agreement retains this provision as a part of section 5 (g) which also provides that native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to enter the United States to perform agricultural labor shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of section 3 of such act of February 5, 1917, which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage money by corporations, foreign government, and others. Such admissions are to be permitted under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General. Such regulations are not to include the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States and in the event they require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident, which he is unable to furnish, the admitting officer may waive such documentary evidence if he has other proof satisfactory to him that such person is a native of the country claimed by him. Each person is to be provided with an identification card with his photograph and fingerprints and if he fails to maintain his status as an agricultural worker or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission he is required to be deported. The authority for these admissions is limited during the period of hostilities in the present war.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
M. C. TARVER,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
ELMER H. WENE,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN.
Managers on the part of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the remarks later to be made in Committee of the Whole I may have permission to insert a short statement issued December 5, 1942, by the Secretary of Agriculture and a letter from the head of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 2481, the agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 2481, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The general debate having concluded, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read to the bottom of page 1, line 6.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill, H. R. 2481, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

URGENT DEFICIENCY

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported House Joint Resolution 155, making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 155 and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the following respective purposes, namely:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office of Censorship

Notwithstanding section 203 of the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, the appropriation to the Office of Censorship contained in such act shall be available in an amount not to exceed $165,000 for printing and binding, and $175,000 for traveling expenses; and in addition such appropriation shall be available for the payment of living and quarters allowances (including heat, fuel, and light) to personnel stationed outside the continental limits of

the United States in accordance with standardized regulations dated December 30, 1942.

INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Public Health Service

Pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1943, for pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, including the objects specified under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1943, $2,900,000.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Locomotive inspection: For an additional amount for locomotive inspection, Interstate Commerce Commission, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, $11,700

The Tax Court of the United States

Salaries and expenses: Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, there may be expended $18,000 for travel expenses from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Board of Tax Appeals, 1943."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is an urgent deficiency appropriation. It is necessary that money be provided immediately in order to meet the final pay roll for April on two of these activities and that authorization for reallocation be immediately provided for the other two. The principal item is for the maintenance of hospitals of the Public Health Service. The need for the additional appropriation is due to the fact that the original estimate was prepared prior to the declaration of war, and war conditions have made it necessary to increase their facilities, personnel and supplies.

The other appropriation is a small item of $11,700 for locomotive inspection required by the Interstate Commerce Commission, due to a change of law effective after the original appropriation was made increasing the rate of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence for persons in travel status.

There are two other paragraphs, neither of which provides an appropriation, one from the Office of Censorship, authorizing the expenditure of additional funds for printing and binding and the other for the Board of Tax Appeals, providing additional allocation of funds for traveling expenses.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution comes in with a unanimous report from the committee. As the gentleman from Missouri said, the only major item is for $2,900,000 for the Public Health Service in the matter of hospitals, including additional cost of rations and additional help required to maintain the injured and wounded in the war. I think the resolution should pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include quotations and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1785. An act for the relief of the William Wrigley Junior Co.;

H. R. 1786. An act for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.;

H. R. 1787. An act for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.; and

H. R. 1857. An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 899. An act to amend the act approved January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries."

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1785. An act for the relief of the William Wrigley Junior Co;

H. R. 1786. An act for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.;

H. R. 1787. An act for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.; and

H. R. 1857. An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 15, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Thursday, April 15, 1943)

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, April 15, 1943.

Business to be considered: Open hearings on the petroleum situation. Independents will testify.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(Tuesday, April 20, 1943)

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2103, a bill to punish the willful injury, destruction, or defective manufacture of property used or intended for use in the preparation for or carrying on of war or national defense, and for other purposes, at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, April 20, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Notice of postponement of hearing

(Thursday, May 13, 1943)

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates, which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

329. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the estimate of appropriation for the Office of Economic Stabilization for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of $100,000 (H. Doc. No. 159); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

330. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $6,889,800 (H. Doc. No. 160); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

331. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the foreign trade zones board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, and the annual report of the city of New York covering operations of the foreign-trade zone at Stapleton, Staten Island, N. Y., during the calendar year 1941; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WARD: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2437. A bill authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; with amendment (Rept. No. 357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1616. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2486. A bill to authorize the appointment as ensigns in

78TH CONGRESS 1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT No. 358

MAKING AN APPROPRIATION TO ASSIST IN PROVIDING A SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR FOR 1943

APRIL 14, 1943.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. J. Res. 96]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96), making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $26,100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943, to be expended by the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator"), appointed pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 9322, dated March 26, 1943, for assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, as follows.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities within the several States, the Administrator shall apportion among the several States, on the basis of need, not less than $9,000,000 and not more than $13,050,000 of the sum appropriated by section 1

and the sums so apportioned shall be available for payment to such States for expenditure by the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in such States in accordance with such agreements as may be entered into by the Administrator and such extension services and subject to the supervision of the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may be expended by such extension services shall include, among other things, (1) the recruiting, placement (including the placement of workers as tenants or sharecroppers), and training of such workers; (2) transportation, supervision, subsistence, protection, health and medical and burial services, and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary personal property; (3) lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services, including former Civilian Conservation Corps camps; (4) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within the United States who are under contractual obligation to reimburse such extension services for such advances; (5) employment of personnel and other administrative expenses; and (6) payment to or reimbursement of other public or private agencies or individuals for furnishing services or facilities for such purposes. Such extension services may enter into agreements with other public and private agencies and individuals and utilize the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals in carrying out the purposes of this section.

(b) The Administrator shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts to be paid to each State under this section and the time or times such amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Administrator, the amounts so certified.

EXPENDITURE OF OTHER FUNDS

Sec. 3. (a) Not more than $13,050,000 of the funds appropriated by section 1 and not apportioned by the Administrator among the several States pursuant to section 2 shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may be expended shall include, among other things, (1) the recruiting and transportation of workers and their families and necessary personal property, within the United States and elsewhere; (2) furnishing, by loans or otherwise, of health and medical and burial services, training, subsistence, allowances, protection, and shelter for such workers and their families; (3) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within the United States who are under contractual obligation to reimburse the United States for such advances; (4) lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services; and (5) operating personnel and expenses to carry out the above purposes.

(b) Not more than 2 per centum of the funds appropriated by section 1 hereof shall be available for administrative expenses of the Administrator, including (1) the employment of persons and organizations, by contract or otherwise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (2) purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; (3) printing and binding; (4) travel expenses of persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating capacities within a foreign country or from a foreign country to the United States and return, including such expenses to first-duty stations; and (5) payment to or reimbursement of other agencies or individuals for administrative expenses incurred by them.

(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution, the Administrator is authorized—

(1) to utilize the facilities, services, and personnel of units and agencies within the Department of Agriculture; to enter into agreements with other public or private agencies or individuals; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals and to delegate to them functions under this joint resolution; and to allocate or transfer funds to (in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944), or otherwise to pay or reimburse such units, agencies, and individuals for expenses in connection therewith;

(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

(3) to cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign governments relating to the importation of workers into the United States.

LIMITATIONS

Sec. 4. (a) No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, if such worker has resided in such county for a period of one year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period.

(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or heretofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country: Provided, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 5. (a) Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be expended without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) Any payments made by the United States or other public or private agencies or employers to aliens brought into the United States under this joint resolution shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution—

(1) the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico;

(2) the term "worker" includes nationals of the United States and aliens;

(3) the term "agricultural labor" includes any services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(d) Effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3 of the Act of June 29, 1936 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 433), receipts derived for the account of the United States from the use and occupancy of agricultural labor supply centers, including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(e) The former Civilian Conservation Corps camps shall be transferred without charge to the Administrator, to the extent that he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution: Provided, That no such camp which is being utilized by any other agency of the Government, or which has been transferred to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization, shall be transferred to the Administrator under this subsection without the consent of such agency, State, county, municipality, or organization.

(f) Notwithstanding provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of April 1943, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual arising from agricultural labor performed by him as an employee, or from labor otherwise performed by him in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities, after the date of enactment of this joint resolution and prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

(g) In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident desiring to enter the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by Section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges, and shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of Section 3 of such Act which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage by corporations, foreign government, or others; and any such resident shall be admitted to perform agricultural labor in the United States for such time and under such conditions (but not including the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States) as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General; and in the event such regulations require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident which he is unable to furnish, such requirement may be waived by the admitting officer of the United States at the point where

such resident seeks entry into the United States if such official has other proof satisfactory to him that such resident is a native of the country claimed as his birthplace. Each such resident shall be provided with an identification card (with his photograph and fingerprints) to be prescribed under such regulations which shall be in lieu of all other documentary requirements, including the registration at time of entry or after entry required by the Alien Registration Act of 1940. Any such resident admitted under the foregoing provisions who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission shall be taken into custody under a warrant issued by the Attorney General at any time after entry and deported in accordance with Section 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917. Sections 5 and 6 of such Act shall not apply to the importation of aliens under this joint resolution. No provision of this joint resolution shall authorize the admission into the United States of any enemy alien.

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
M. C. TARVER,
ELMER H. WENE,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943" submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment.

The House measure appropriates a total of $26,100,000 for the farm labor program to be expended under the direction and supervision of the United States Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in the several States. Of this sum, $100,000 is ear-marked for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of Extension, not less than $13,500,000 for apportionment to the extension services of the States for the farm labor program within the States, and not to exceed $12,500,000 for use cooperatively by the Federal Office of Extension, the State extension services, and the United States Employment Service in connection with interstate and imported farm labor.

The Senate amendment provides a total appropriation of $40,000,000 to be expended under the supervision and direction of the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution appointed pursuant to the Executive order of March 26, 1943, of which not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000 is for apportionment to the several States for use by the extension services for agricultural labor within the States and not more than $20,000,000 is made available for expenditure by the Administrator for recruiting, transporting, and placing farm labor within the United States and elsewhere. In connection with the latter sum the Administrator is authorized to utilize facilities, services, and personnel within the Department of Agriculture and to enter into agreements with other public or private agencies or individuals and to utilize their facilities and services.

The conference agreement retains the House amount of $26,100,000 to be expended "by" the Administrator instead of "under his direction and supervision" as proposed by the Senate, for the purposes and in the manner set forth in the resolution, and instead of under the direction and supervision of the United States Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges as provided in the House measure.

The conference agreement retains the Senate provision with respect to allocations to the States for expenditure by the State extension services for workers within the States, fixing the sum to be so apportioned at not less than $9,000,000 and not more than $13,050,000 instead of not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000 as provided by the Senate and not less than $13,500,000 as provided by the House.

The conference agreement retains the Senate provision for the expenditure of a portion of the appropriation by the Administrator reducing the amount from not to exceed $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate to not to exceed $13,050,000, and eliminates the provision in the House measure for the expenditure of not to exceed $12,500,000 by cooperative agreement of the Federal Office of Extension, the State extension services, and the United States Employment Service with respect to interstate and imported labor. The Senate provision is further modified by eliminating authority for the making of grants, the use of repayments of money advances as a credit to the appropriation, and the placement of workers.

The Senate amendment contains a provision similar to that in the House measure with respect to the transportation of workers out of a county without prior consent of the county extension agent. It differs from the House provision in that it does not require consent of the State commissioner of agriculture in the case of transportation of agricultural labor out of the State. The Senate amendment places a requirement of 1 year's prior residence and engagement in agricultural labor as a requisite to the applicability of the provision and further stipulates that an appeal may be taken to the Administrator from the action of the county agent in refusing transportation to such worker. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision eliminating therefrom the appellate feature.

The Senate amendment contains a provision similar to that in the House measure prohibiting the use of the funds to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership in connection with agricultural labor. The Senate amendment differs from the House measure in that it excepts from the provision imported workers to the extent required to comply with agreements with foreign governments and also permits the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural labor which may provide that prevailing wages shall be paid for particular crops and areas and that shelter shall be provided for such labor. The conference agreement adopts the Senate language.

The Senate amendment and the House measure contain provisions with respect to expenditure of the funds without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (competitive bidding) and the exemption from the withholding or deduction provisions of section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code in connection with payments to aliens brought in under the joint resolution. The conference agreement retains these provisions.

The Senate amendment contains provision for covering into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, effective July 1, 1943, the revenues to be obtained from use and occupancy of agricultural labor supply centers. In the absence of such provision such revenues would be available for reexpenditure. The House measure contained no comparable requirement. The conference agreement adopts the Senate language.

The Senate amendment and the House measure contain similar provisions with respect to the use of Civilian Conservation Corps camps for farm labor shelter. The Senate language, however, provides that any camp being utilized by any other agency of the Govern-

ment or which has been transferred to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization shall not be transferred for use under the joint resolution without the consent of the agency or organization utilizing it. The conference agreement accepts the Senate modification.

The House measure placed no limit upon the amount of the appropriation that could be used for administrative expenses except in the case of the allocation of $100,000 to the Federal Office of Extension. The Senate amendment prescribes that not more than 2 per centum of the appropriation may be used for administrative expenses of the Administrator and sets forth the major categories of such expense. The conference agreement adopts the Senate recommendation.

The Senate amendment (sec. 5f) contains provisions designed to permit recipients of old-age assistance under the Social Security Act to work as agricultural workers during the continuance of the hostilities in the present war, and for 6 months thereafter, without having such assistance discontinued or reduced. The House measure contained no corresponding provisions. The conference agreement retains these provisions in amended form. Title I of the Social Security Act now provides for grants-in-aid to the States for old-age assistance, and provides that such grants will be made only with respect to assistance for needy individuals. This means that if any recipient of old-age assistance should earn money for working on a farm, his old-age assistance might be reduced or discontinued on the ground that his need was less or no longer existed. The provisions in the conference agreement will enable the States, if they so desire, to continue to pay old-age assistance at the present rates to persons who are receiving such assistance at the present time, notwithstanding the fact that such persons earn income as agricultural workers during the continuance of hospitals in the present war and the succeeding 6 months; and the Federal grants-in-aid with respect to such assistance will continue to be made without regard to the fact that the States in such cases do not take such income into consideration for the purpose of determining the need of such persons for old-age assistance.

The Senate amendment (sec. 5b) provides that aliens brought into the United States under the joint resolution shall be exempt from the payment of head-tax required by section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges. The House measure contains no corresponding provision. The conference agreement retains this provision as a part of section 5 (g) which also provides that native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to enter the United States to perform agricultural labor shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of section 3 of such act of February 5, 1917 which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage money by corporations, foreign government, and others. Such admissions are to be permitted under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General. Such regulations are not to include the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States and in the event they require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident, which he is unable to furnish, the admitting officer may waive such documentary evidence if he has other proof satisfactory to him that such person is a native of

the country claimed by him. Each person is to be provided with an identification card with his photograph and fingerprints and if he fails to maintain his status as an agricultural worker or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission he is required to be deported. The authority for these admissions is limited during the period of hostilities in the present war.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
M. C. TARVER,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
ELMER H. WENE,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

○

April 15

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to discuss the refugee question and the Bermuda conference that is to take place shortly, but I find that time does not allow it. However, I join my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, in the belief that our committee should be represented at the Bermuda conference.

The world is afire. Millions of people are being slaughtered. The civilized world is looking to all free nations and all democracies to do something for the unfortunate women and children who are in danger of being killed. The United States will be called upon to do its share in this great program.

It seems to me that some members of our committee should be present to advise the conference with respect to a legislative program. Without injury to our economic structure we can open the door to a certain number of people by using the unused quotas that have not been allocated for the last 5 years. The Allied Nations will do nothing unless we in this country extend our sympathy to these refugees and allow a certain number to come into this country. For that reason I support House Resolution 209.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE JAPANESE PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I was very mucl. concerned about a news item appearing in the Washington Evening Star yesterday quoting Gen. John L. De Witt, commanding general of the Western Defense Command in San Francisco, who made a very interesting comment regarding the Japanese situation on the Pacific coast:

> "A Jap's a Jap," and "it makes no difference whether he is an American citizen or not," Lt. Gen. John L. De Witt said yesterday in opposing "the sentiment developing to bring back some of the Japanese to the west coast."

He said further:

> I don't want any of them. We got them out. They were a dangerous element. The west coast is too vital and too vulnerable to take any chances.

I think there is a tendency on the part of the American people generally to minimize the importance of the Japanese situation in the United States, particularly because the events in the far Pacific have been favorable to us during the past few months, although the situation is serious at the present time.

I have a resolution pending before the Committee on Rules calling for an investigation of the entire Japanese problem in the United States. There are conflicting rumors, charges, and counter charges continually concerning the Japanese problem. The greatest confusion exists in the minds of the American public regarding this question. I submit, gentlemen, Congress has the responsibility to investigate all the facts in this situation. I believe it can best be handled by Congress delving into the whole question and solving it in a realistic matter of fact and humane fashion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include a statement made by me on the floor of the House on Friday, April 9, 1943, during the consideration of the bill H. R. 653, known as the Hobbs bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. SADOWSKI. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain resolutions adopted by the Child Care Conference of Wayne County, C. I. O. Council, Detroit, Mich., March 28, 1943, in respect to the placing of child care under a centralized Federal agency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES SHOULD ADVOCATE INTERNATIONAL BIMETALISM AFTER THE WAR

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, recently a meeting was held here in the Capitol, attended by a large number of Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. The occasion was an address by Mr. Francis H. Brownell, president of the great American Smelting & Refining Co., of New York City, an organization that has world-wide international mining business, and is a great producer of the precious metal. Mr. Brownell went into some detail to explain his position concerning the international monetary system to be established after the war. The meeting was very interesting, and some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle suggested that they would like to have a meeting of the members of their party and invite Mr. Brownell to a conference, so that he might be able to explain to the Members on that side the meaning of this international situation.

I ask unanimous consent in this connection to revise and extend my remarks and include his address, as to which I have an estimate from the Public Printer. It will cost about $150.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

WOULD HELP LEADERSHIP

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] seldom gets as far off base as he did the other night when he said that "if President Roosevelt were to announce he was not a candidate, he would impair his position in Congress and elsewhere as our war leader."

Out of his own experience as floor leader of a disturbed Democratic Party, the gentleman must know better. The truth, I venture to assert, is that nothing would so greatly strengthen the President's position in Congress and elsewhere as a flat declaration by him that he would not be a candidate for a fourth term as President under any circumstances.

Nothing would so strengthen his leadership in advocating post-war policies as to divorce his advocacy from his personal political fortunes. He would become then the voice of a great cause and not the voice of ambition. There is no other explanation for the groundswell of anti-fourth-term resolutions by State legislatures.

It may be, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has complained, that the fourth-term issue has become a subject of politics, but the issue, if it has become such, was raised by the chairman of the National Democratic Committee when, at this time, with conventions months away, he called for a short campaign, knowing full well that would be to the advantage of a President in office seeking renomination. His action was that of a basketball team, in possession of the ball and one point ahead, stalling for time and praying for the referee's whistle.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on House Joint Resolution 96, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri calls up a conference on a joint resolution. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk reported the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the statement of the conferees be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see House proceedings of April 14, 1943.)

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is primarily to help in winning of the war.

In the production of food—the most essential munition of war—the lack of farm labor is a serious bottleneck. The purpose of this bill is to provide for the employment, transportation, and distribution of farm labor to points where it will be most effective in the production of food.

As will be recalled, the principal difference between the House and the Senate bills was, first, the amount provided by the bill and, second, the method of administration and control. The House provided for an appropriation of $26,100,000 and the Senate increased that amount to $40,000,000.

The conference agreement retains the House amount of $26,100,000 to be expended "by" the Administrator instead of "under his direction and supervision," as proposed by the Senate, for the purposes and in the manner set forth in the resolution, and instead of under the direction and supervision of the United States Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges as provided in the House measure.

The conference agreement retains the Senate provision with respect to allocations to the States for expenditure by the State extension services for workers within the States fixing the sum to be so apportioned at not less than $9,000,000 and not more than $13,050,000, instead of not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000, as provided by the Senate, and not less than $13,500,000. as provided by the House.

The conference agreement retains the Senate provision for the expenditure of a portion of the appropriation by the Administrator reducing the amount from not to exceed $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate to not to exceed $13,050,000, and eliminates the provision in the House measure for the expenditure of not to exceed $12,500,000 by cooperative agreement of the Federal Office of Extension, the State extension services, and the United States Employment Service with respect to interstate and imported labor. The Senate provision is further modified by eliminating authority for the making of grants, the use of repayments of money advances as a credit to the appropriation, and the placement of workers.

The Senate amendment—section 5b—provides that aliens brought into the United States under the joint resolution shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges. The House measure contains no corresponding provision. The conference agreement retains this provision as a part of section 5 (g) which also provides that native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to enter the United States to perform agricultural labor shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of section 3 of such act of February 5, 1917, which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage money by corporations, foreign government, and others. Such admissions are to be permitted under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General. Such regulations are not to include the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States and in the event they require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident, which he is unable to furnish, the admitting officer may waive such documentary evidence if he has other proof satisfactory to him that such person is a native of the country claimed by him. Each person is to be provided with an identification card with his photograph and fingerprints, and if he fails to maintain his status as an agricultural worker or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission he is required to be deported. The authority for these admissions is limited during the period of hostilities in the present war.

Mr. Speaker, there is much in this legislation that is in the nature of an experiment. But it is the practically unanimous agreement of the conferees of the two Houses arrived at after exhaustive consideration and is the most practical solution of the problem that we have been able to devise. t is at least a step in the right direction.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this comes with the unanimous report of all of the conferees on the part of the House who were able to be with us at the end of the negotiations with the Senate. The amount carried in the report is the sum of $26,100,000, which was carried in the bill when it passed the House. That is divided equally between the Extension Service of the land-grant colleges in the different States, and the Administrator of Food Supply, who was appointed by the President while the bill was pending in the Senate. I believe that most of the abuses that were created by the Farm Security Administration in the handling of interstate and foreign labor on farms will be eliminated as a result of this bill.

In addition, there is an amendment at the end which will permit Western Hemisphere native-born residents to come here temporarily to work on farms. On the other hand, there is a protection against people coming in here, whom the War Department and the rest of us would not like to see. In other words, everyone who comes in is obliged to be photographed and fingerprinted before he comes in and must carry an identification card that will protect us against trouble and make those people go out when we wish. There is also in the bill prohibiting the movement of this labor between the States at the expense of the Government without the consent of the local county agricultural agents.

On the other hand, there is nothing in the bill that will prevent these people moving from State to State if they want to do so on their own account and not at Government expense.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Is provision made for them to be returned to their home countries after the war?

Mr. TABER. After the period of their employment in the agricultural enterprise is concluded. It does not wait until the end of the war. At any time it is desirable that they be sent back, they can be sent back under the provisions of this amendment that was worked out in conference day before yesterday.

I hope that the report will be adopted because I believe that at any rate insofar as the intrastate effort is concerned—that is, within the individual States—it will help very materially, and it will help to a very large extent on the importation of foreign labor.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. CANNON of Missouri, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 52]

Allen, Ill.	Gamble	Myers
Anderson, Calif.	Gavagan	O'Hara
Baldwin, Md.	Gibson	O'Leary
Barry	Gordon	O'Toole
Bates, Mass.	Guyer	Outland
Bell	Hagen	Pfeifer
Boykin	Hart	Price
Bradley, Mich.	Heffernan	Robinson, Utah
Bradley, Pa.	Hendricks	Rogers, Calif.
Buckley	Hess	Rowe
Burgin	Holmes, Mass.	Russell
Byrne	Izac	Scott
Cannon, Fla.	Judd	Smith, Maine
Capozzoli	Kennedy	Smith, Va.
Carter	Keogh	Starnes, Ala.
Celler	King	Stearns, N. H.
Culkin	Klein	Stevenson
D'Alesandro	Larcade	Taylor
Dies	Lewis, Colo.	Tolan
Dingell	Luce	Treadway
Disney	Lynch	Vursell
Douglas	McGranery	Wadsworth
Elliott	McWilliams	Walter
Ellison	Maas	Weaver
Ellsworth	Madden	Whelchel, Ga.
Fay	Magnuson	Wilson
Fogarty	Merritt	Winter
Forand	Mott	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 351 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two separate subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

April 16

might hire must come from the present plywood factories and would increase the serious manpower shortage and decrease production in plywood plants which are now effectively serving aircraft builders.

It cannot be denied that it is a serious mistake to allow any materials for building and equipment which is not definitely needed.

It would be infinitely more desirable if emergency requirements should arise to utilize facilities already partially equipped and thus save critical materials and manpower. The plywood industry which embraces many small manufacturers has largely at its own expense equipped itself so that its production is now several times the present or anticipated requirements according to all information which has been made available to me.

I wish to protest any hasty or ill-advised action in this connection and I respectfully call for an immediate report.

Yours for victory,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

APRIL 5, 1943.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In response to your inquiry of April 2 regarding the approval for the plywood plant addition at the Higgins aircraft plant in New Orleans. On November 17, 1942, the War Production Board approved the construction of an aircraft plant to be operated by the Higgins Aircraft Co. at New Orleans at a cost of approximately $20,000,000. Subsequently thereto, additional projects at the installation were approved, bringing the total to $23,735,000.

Thereafter the Higgins Aircraft Co. requested approval for a plywood addition to be operated solely in connection with the construction of the cargo-carrying plane program, and which plywood addition involved an expenditure of only $255,000. This request was reviewed and it was determined that if plywood were purchased from existing manufacturers for the use of the Higgins Aircraft Co. that it would be necessary that this plywood be manufactured under humidity control and that the plywood thus manufactured would require careful packing in moisture-resistant packages so that it would be received by the Higgins Aircraft Co. in proper condition for wood aircraft manufacture. It was further determined that the Higgins plant would also have to be air-conditioned and humidity controlled in order to properly manufacture wood aircraft parts and completed planes. It was considered in the best interest of the war effort to authorize the expenditure of $255,000 rather than to interject any obstacle to a project which had already been approved and which totaled $23,735,000. Surveys by the War Production Board indicate an excess of plywood over all present war and civilian requirements of approximately 1,000,000 square feet per month. This covers all classes of plywood and not only aircraft plywood.

Except for the seven plywood plants located in Oregon and Washington, all plywood plants in this country are operating at least one full shift at capacity, and the seven plants in Oregon and Washington are not operating at capacity, due to the log shortage and labor conditions surrounding this situation in the western territory.

The views of all branches of the War Production Board have been taken into consideration. The project was considered as a whole.

The project has again been reviewed and again it is the determination that the $255,000 expenditure for that portion of the Higgins aircraft plant is essential as part of the total expenditure in excess of $24,000,000, and that it is considered good policy to centralize responsibility for the entire program, especially when this can be accomplished for only 1 percent of the cost of the total project. The approval of the plywood addition to the Higgins project is the approval of a necessary link in the entire project and not the approval of another plywood plant.

If you have any further question or desire any further specific information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. WILSON.

APRIL 7, 1943.

Mr. C. E. WILSON,
Vice Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: Thank you for your letter of April 5, 1943, in reply to my letter concerning the proposed plywood plant addition in New Orleans.

Your letter is apparently identical in its wording with views expressed in a letter by Donald M. Nelson.

Frankly, however, I am less concerned with what your letter states than with what it does not state.

Accordingly, I am requesting your immediate reply to certain definite questions. I should ordinarily hesitate to request such an early reply except that I am certain that, of course, you undoubtedly have all of the information and files readily at hand or you could not otherwise have made your decision respecting the plywood plant addition at the Higgins Aircraft plant in New Orleans.

I am interested in ascertaining the answer to the following questions:

1. Is it true that the Higgins concern took up the question of the availability of aircraft plywood with the Army Air Forces aircraft scheduling unit at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio?

2. Is it true that this scheduling unit subsequently made an investigation of the entire matériel situation?

3. Is it true that this aircraft scheduling unit advised Higgins that they could supply him with the required aircraft plywood (from existing producers) to meet his production schedule without interfering with the present aircraft production schedule?

4. Is it true that subsequently the Higgins concern brought this matter to the attention of the War Production Board in Washington?

5. Is it true that the War Production Board subsequently made an independent survey?

6. Is it true that the War Production Board then came to the same conclusion as the aircraft scheduling unit—namely, that there was sufficient productive capacity in the United States to take care of all requirements, including Higgins' proposed program?

7. Is it true then that the approval of the plywood addition for the Higgins aircraft plant in New Orleans reverses the original conclusions of Wright Field and the War Production Board?

8. If the original surveys of the aircraft scheduling unit at Wright Field and the original War Production Board survey indicated that sufficient production was available to supply the proposed Higgins aircraft plant, in what manner has that plywood supply or the outlook for the future plywood supply been altered? In other words, what is the basis for the change, if there has been a change of attitude?

9. Is it true that the proposed plywood plant addition to the Higgins aircraft plant at New Orleans would require the use of critical and strategic materials for its construction?

10. Is it true that in the operation of this proposed plywood plant addition some personnel or labor would probably be drawn from existing plywood manufacturers?

11. Is it true that there is already a shortage of manpower in the plywood industry?

12. Is it true that the Lumber Division of the War Production Board and the Plywood and Veneer Section both originally opposed construction of the proposed plywood plant addition at New Orleans?

13. If they did originally oppose the project, have they changed their views, and, if so, on what basis?

14. In your letter you mention the manufacture of plywood under humidity control. Is it contended at the present time that existing manufacturers do not manufacture plywood under humidity control?

15. Is it true that the current practice in the plywood industry at the present time is to ship plywood in a manner designed to resist moisture?

16. Has it been definitely established that an air-conditioned plant is essential to the production of aircraft plywood?

17. If such air conditioning is necessary to a degree beyond the ordinary humidity controls employed in plywood plants, would it not be possible to install such air-conditioning equipment in existing plants?

18. In view of your statement that at the present time there is an excess of plywood over all present war and civilian requirements of approximately 1,000,000 square feet per month, is it contended that the new plant is needed to supply additional aircraft plywood? And if so, please explain.

19. Is it true that leaders in the industry have indicated that if additional production beyond the present surplus is needed, that such production can be readily secured from existing facilities?

I also read with interest your statement that "it is considered good policy to centralize responsibility for the entire program, especially when this can be accomplished for only 1 percent of the cost of the total project."

The item of $255,000 as an item of expense is not the basic issue. The basic issue is whether existing plywood facilities are adequate and whether the proposed addition would represent a duplication and whether it would represent critical materials and labor in its construction.

Another very obvious question is whether the new project in its operation would require personnel and labor diverted from existing facilities to the detriment of the war program

Please understand that these questions are directed to you not in an effort to embarrass you but to secure an accurate factual résumé of a number of points which are apparently in dispute. I am vitally interested in this matter and I can assure you that at all times I will vigorously protest any unwarranted duplication in any field where there are existing adequate facilities whose duplication during a war period particularly involves critical materials and critical manpower and a possible disruption of existing facilities.

Yours for victory,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

APRIL 13, 1943.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Aknowledgment is made of your letter of April 7 in which you present a number of questions relating to plywood facilities in connection with the Higgins aircraft project in New Orleans.

I am certain that you fully realize that direct answers which you request to specified questions do not tell the complete story. Questions and answers to be of value should be considered only with the entire project under consideration.

Questions 1 through 7 may be answered in the affirmative.

The answer to question 8 is that nothing in the supply-demand situation on an overall basis has occurred to alter the general conclusion that there is sufficient capacity in the United States to produce airplane-grade plywood to meet the demands of our

aircraft program as now defined if that, by itself, was the only question under consideration.

Question 9 is answered in the affirmative with the qualifications that the amounts of critical and strategic materials needed for the plywood part of the Higgins project are no formidable.

Question 10 is answered in the negative. We have the assurance of the Higgins organization that in their employ are key men of the requisite skills to operate the veneer and plywood parts of the project and that the additional ordinary labor needed is readily available in the area of the Higgins project. We have been assured that there is no need to nor will there be any pirating of men from existing plywood or veneer manufacturers.

As to question 11, our analysis indicates that any shortage in the lumber field is of men engaged in getting logs out of the woods.

Question 12 is answered in the affirmative but only when consideration was given to the project as a separate plywood plant and not as a vital part of the entire Higgins Co. aircraft program.

As to question 13, the plan as a coordinated, entire project is approved by the War Production Board.

In answer to question 14, it may be stated that some manufacturers of plywood employ humidity controls in their plants (for example, the Crescent Co. of Louisville, Ky.); some do not (for example, the Roddis Co. of Marshfield, Wis.). The practice depends upon the climatic conditions in the areas of manufacture.

Question 15 is answered in the affirmative and the degree of protection afforded depends upon the distance of the shipment and the locality of the consumer.

Question 16 cannot be answered categorically. Air conditioning would be required in a plywood plant located in such an area as New Orleans. It might not be needed in localities in the North, but if plywood is to be shipped to New Orleans it will be requisite that air conditioning warehouse facilities be provided in New Orleans if that is where the aircraft is manufactured. This would also require proper and special packing, shipping, handling, etc.

Questions 17 and 19 are answered in the affirmative.

Question 18 directly raises the basis of approving the Higgins project. As previously stated, the decision was not upon the grounds that there was not sufficient plywood capacity in the United States to meet the needs of the aircraft plywood program. An over-all program for the Higgins Aircraft Co. was approved. This involved a plant expenditure of over $24,000,000 for the production of cargo plywood planes. Mr. Higgins stated repeatedly that a necessary condition to the satisfactory completion of his contract was that he be able to control directly, on the spot, the production of the particular kind of plywood needed for his project. He cited numerous difficulties that he has encountered in the past in obtaining the quantities of plywood necessary to his boat-building program and stated further that the prices charged have been considerably in excess of what appeared to him to be reasonable. In view of the soundness of representations made by Mr. Higgins that his responsibility for the proper performance of his entire airplane contract was importantly conditioned upon being given complete control over the production of the necessary plywood, it was considered poor economy to insist upon the saving of a very small percentage of the project cost if by so doing we would becloud the issue as to where the responsibility lay for carrying the complete project through to a successful conclusion.

I am in complete accord with your expressed aim of preventing the expenditure of funds and the use of scarce materials for unnecessary facilities. However, I have equally strong convictions about the placing of responsibility. In this case, after reviewing all the facts, I resolved that the plywood project warranted approval.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. WILSON.

JEFFERSON AND EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Jefferson and Education" delivered by him at the Hotel Alms, Cincinnati, Ohio, April 13, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIFTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE PAN AMERICAN UNION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Pan American Day Cooperative Foundation of Pittsburgh, Pa., April 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS JEFFERSON — ADDRESS AND ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles prepared by Senator THOMAS of Utah, one entitled "Jefferson Gave Us Our War Aims," broadcast on April 13, 1943, and the other entitled "Jefferson and the New World," prepared for New Masses of March 17, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Freedom of the Press" delivered by him before the Washington (D. C.) Kiwanis Club on April 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASTAGE OF MANPOWER AND ITS UNECONOMICAL UTILIZATION IN THE WAR EFFORT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLMAN

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the manuscript of a radio speech prepared by him upon the wastage of manpower and its uneconomical utilization in the war effort, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTRUCTION OF POWER PLANTS IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOLMAN

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him relative to the construction of power plants in the United States and Canada, which appears in the Appendix.]

SELECTIVE CIVILIAN WAR SERVICE—STATEMENT BY UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR PATTERSON

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, April 13, 1943, relating to House bill 1742, the Austin-Wadsworth bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

OFFICIAL TRIBUTE TO THOMAS JEFFERSON BY CLAUDE G. BOWERS

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address prepared by Claude G. Bowers as the Nation's official tribute to Thomas Jefferson on the occasion of the dedication of the Jefferson Memorial, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE PHILIPPINES—ADDRESS BY SERGIO OSMEÑA

[Mr. HAYDEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The United Nations and the Philippines, delivered by Hon. Sergio Osmeña, Vice President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, at the forty-seventh annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia, April 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERMENT CONTROL OF NEWS—ARTICLE BY FREDERIC W. COLLINS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Government Control of News," written by Frederic W. Collins, and published in the Providence (R. I.) Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96), making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $26,100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943, to be expended by the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator"), appointed pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 9322, dated March 26, 1943, for assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, as follows:

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities within the several States, the Administrator shall apportion among the several States, on the basis of need, not less than $9,000,000 and not more than $13,050,000 of the sum appropriated by section 1 and the sums so apportioned shall be available for payment to such States for expenditure by the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in such States in accordance with such agreements as may be entered into by the Administrator and such extension services and subject to the supervision of the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may be expended by such extension services shall include, among other things, (1) the recruiting, placement (including the placement of workers as tenants or sharecroppers), and training of such workers; (2) transportation, supervision, subsistence, protection, health and medical and burial services, and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary personal property; (3) lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services, including former Civilian Conservation Corps camps; (4) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within the United States who

are under contractual obligation to reimburse such extension services for such advances; (5) employment of personnel and other administrative expenses; and (6) payment to or reimbursement of other public or private agencies or individuals for furnishing services or facilities for such purposes. Such extension services may enter into agreements with other public and private agencies and individuals and utilize the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals in carrying out the purposes of this section.

"(b) The Administrator shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts to be paid to each State under this section and the time or times such amounts are to be paid, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Administrator, the amounts so certified.

"EXPENDITURE OF OTHER FUNDS

"SEC. 3. (a) Not more than $13,050,000 of the funds appropriated by section 1 and not apportioned by the Administrator among the several States pursuant to section 2 shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may be expended shall include, among other things, (1) the recruiting and transportation of workers and their families and necessary personal property, within the United States and elsewhere; (2) furnishing, by loans or otherwise, of health and medical and burial services, training, subsistence, allowances, protection, and shelter for such workers and their families; (3) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within the United States who are under contractual obligation to reimburse the United States for such advances; (4) lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services; and (5) operating personnel and expenses to carry out the above purposes.

"(b) Not more than 2 percent of the funds appropriated by section 1 hereof shall be available for administrative expenses of the Administrator, including (1) the employment of persons and organizations, by contract or otherwise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (2) purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; (3) printing and binding; (4) travel expenses of persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating capacities within a foreign country or from a foreign country to the United States and return, including such expenses to first-duty stations, and (5) payment to or reimbursement of other agencies or individuals for administrative expenses incurred by them.

"(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution, the Administrator is authorized—

"(1) to utilize the facilities, services, and personnel of units and agencies within the Department of Agriculture; to enter into agreements with other public or private agencies or individuals; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals and to delegate to them functions under this joint resolution; and to allocate or transfer funds to (in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944), or otherwise to pay or reimburse such units, agencies, and individuals for expenses in connection therewith;

"(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

"(3) to cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign governments relating to the importation of workers into the United States.

"LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 4. (a) No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, if such worker has resided in such county for a period of one year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period.

"(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or heretofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

"MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 5. (a) Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be expended without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"(b) Any payments made by the United States or other public or private agencies or employers to aliens brought into the United States under this joint resolution shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution—

"(1) the term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico;

"(2) the term 'worker' includes nationals of the United States and aliens;

"(3) the term 'agricultural labor' includes any services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(d) Effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3 of the Act of June 29, 1936 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 433), receipts derived for the account of the United States from the use and occupancy of agricultural labor supply centers, including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(e) The former Civilian Conservation Corps camps shall be transferred without charge to the Administrator, to the extent that he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution: *Provided*, That no such camp which is being utilized by any other agency of the Government, or which has been transferred to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization, shall be transferred to the Administrator under this subsection without the consent of such agency, State, county, municipality, or organization.

"(f) Notwithstanding provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of April 1943, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual arising from agricultural labor performed by him as an employee, or from labor otherwise performed by him in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities, after the date of enactment of this joint resolution and prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

"(g) In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident desiring to enter the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by Section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges, and shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of Section 3 of such Act which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage by corporations, foreign government, or others; and any such resident shall be admitted to perform agricultural labor in the United States for such time and under such conditions (but not including the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States) as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General; and in the event such regulations require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident which he is unable to furnish, such requirement may be waived by the admitting officer of the United States at the point where such resident seeks entry into the United States if such official has other proof satisfactory to him that such resident is a native of the country claimed as his birthplace. Each such resident shall be provided with an identification card (with his photograph and fingerprints) to be prescribed under such regulations which shall be in lieu of all other documentary requirements, including the registration at time of entry or after entry required by the Alien Registration Act of 1940. Any such resident admitted under the foregoing provisions who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission shall be taken into custody under a warrant issued by the Attorney General at any time after entry and deported in accordance with Section 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917. Sections 5 and 6 of such Act shall not apply to the importation of aliens under this joint resolution. No provision of this joint resolution shall authorize the admission into the United States of any enemy alien."

And the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
M. C. TARVER,
ELMER H. WENE,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor. The conference report is a privileged matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senate that the House passed a joint resolution regarding farm labor, which came to the Senate. Under the measure as it passed the House $26,100,000 were appropriated. The joint resolution, as passed by the House, contained many provisions which were not agreed to by the Senate. As a matter of fact, the Senate committee reported an entirely different measure, which was afterward passed by the Senate. It carried an appropriation of $40,000,000.

When the joint resolution came to be considered in conference, the first important change made was that the Senate conferees had to agree to a reduction of the amount from $40,000,000 to $26,100,000, the amount fixed by the House when it passed the joint resolution. Frankly, I do not see much objection to that.

A change was made in the amount to be paid to the extension services. The Senate amendment provided that not less than $9,000,000 and not more than $13,050,000 of the sum appropriated should be allocated to the States for the extension services in the various States, so far as workers in the various States were concerned. The conference committee did not have much trouble in agreeing upon that half, so to speak, of the measure which provides $13,050,000 for the farm-labor service within the States.

Then under section 3 of the amendment recommended by the conference committee, $13,050,000 of the money appropriated by section 1 is proposed to be appropriated for the interstate service and for the foreign service, because, as we all know, a great many workers have been imported from Mexico heretofore, and it was supposed that a good many would be imported from Mexico, and possibly some from other countries. However, certain restrictions were placed upon the importation of labor. No persons were to be imported except from North America, South America, Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto. No persons were to come from European or eastern countries.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Was that modification a compromise, or was it made upon the insistence of the House conferees?

Mr. McKELLAR. The modification was a compromise arrangement, and I think a very fair one. The States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, Wyoming, and other Western States were tremendously interested in that feature of the joint resolution, as was also the State of Michigan, which must have a good many itinerant laborers, and I think New York State also must have such laborers at stated periods. The $13,050,000 was agreed to for that purpose, but limitations were placed upon it. In other words, not more than 2 percent of the funds to be used may be used for administrative purposes. There are a number of other limitations in the measure to which I need not refer.

The conferees finally used the Senate measure as a base for coming to an agreement. What the conferees did was to bring about a modification of the Senate measure rather than the House measure which had already been passed by the House.

Mr. President, I wish to say that when the joint resolution first came before the committee I was ill and unable to be present, and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] became the head of the subcommittee. I think if Senators will examine the report they will find that the Senator from Georgia and Senators working with him achieved an excellent result. A very difficult situation confronted them. Questions relating to immigration came up for consideration. I am speaking of the second half of the joint resolution. There was practically no dispute with respect to the first half. Members of the House and Members of the Senate had no trouble in agreeing with respect to the first half of the measure, but when it came to the second half there was very great difference of opinion. A great many limitations were placed in it, because it was necessary to make certain that the greatest care was exercised in dealing with immigration, and strict provisions were placed in the measure providing for taking these workers out of the country after the emergency period is over.

One other provision was placed in the measure which I think is valuable. Old men who are now receiving old-age pensions would be precluded from doing such work as the measure deals with if the present law were not changed; that is, if they undertook such work they would lose their old-age pensions. The next to the last section of the measure provides that such men may engage in agricultural work without losing their pensions. I think that is a very wise provision.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Would that provision cover postal employees who have retired? Could they now go back and work for the Post Office Department under the provisions of this measure?

Mr. McKELLAR. It refers only to social security, and I suppose they could do so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In respect to the question of immigration, what measures were taken in conference for protection in that situation?

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator mean what measures were taken to protect against the workers remaining in the country?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; what measures were taken concerning those who may be brought into this country? Was the bringing in of such labor limited to certain areas or to certain countries?

Mr. McKELLAR. The bringing in of such labor is limited to those countries with which the United States has agreements. The State Department last year or the previous year made an agreement with Mexico, and since then I think has made an agreement with the Bahama Islands. I wish to say to the Senator from West Virginia that agricultural laborers brought into the United States must be native-born persons of the country with which we have the contract or agreement. In other words, a person who is not a native-born Mexican cannot go to Mexico, and then come into the United States under this provision. He must be a native-born Mexican, or if brought in from Haiti, must be a native-born Haitian, or if he comes from the Bahama Islands he must be a native-born Bahamian. I think the committee has used all the care of which it is capable to make sure that there will be no loopholes with respect to the question of immigration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I observe on page 4 of the conference report, paragraph (g), this language:

> In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto—

Is that not the only reference made to the geographical regions from which laborers may be brought in?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. The conferees thought that language covered the situation.

Mr. President, I wish to say to Senators that I am familiar with the measure. I took no part in the hearings had before the subcommittee, but I learned a great deal about it in the conference committee, in which I took part. However, I wish to refer all Senators who have questions to ask to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is, to my mind, an expert on every question raised in this measure. I will say again that no Senator could have done better or more conscientious or more successful work on a piece of legislation than the Senator from Georgia has done in this instance. So I will ask any Senator who from now on wishes to know something about the measure, to direct his questions to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was one of the conferees on the joint resolution. I did not sign the conference report because I still have a good many misgivings about this proposal. I can say at the outset that the measure which was passed by the Senate was much better than the one which was passed by the House, and I think the joint resolution which came out of conference is by far

the best measure of the three. Certainly I join with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] in the admiration and appreciation which I have for the work done by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Certainly he has labored hard, and has complete mastery of the subject.

However, there are in the joint resolution certain items which I think are open to very serious question. The first occurs on page 3 of the conference report, in section 4 (b), in which the statement is made that—

> No part of the funds herein appropriated * * * shall be used directly or indirectly to * * * impose minimum * * * housing standards * * *, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country. * * *

That seems to me to be an extraordinary statement. It is a matter of common knowledge, well-known to practically every American citizen, that the housing standards in the countries of many of the migratory workers are extremely bad; and yet in a statute we propose to go on record as saying that none of the funds appropriated shall be used to improve those miserable housing standards unless the worker involved happens to be a foreign worker who is imported into the United States. That is something to which I can not subscribe.

Then, on page 4, in paragraph (g), appears one of the basic features of the conference report. It is in connection with the importation of workers into this country. All of us can agree that it is worth while to import foreign laborers into this country to do needed farm work. We can also agree, I think, that it would be much better to do without some of the products of agriculture than it would be to open a loophole whereby hostile saboteurs or hostile aliens could sneak into our country. We can agree to both those propositions. I am willing to concede, and do concede, that a conscientious effort was made in paragraph (g) to safeguard the admission of aliens; but that every precaution has been observed, as was stated here a moment ago, I think must be denied. A great deal has been made of the fact that the admission of aliens shall be confined to the admission of native-born residents of the foreign country concerned. I do not need to dwell on the fact that in a great many of the countries which are contemplated under the act no very elaborate or very accurate or very hard and fast system is established for the registration of births, and that we would scarcely be willing to rest our whole policy on the birth records which exist in many of those countries.

Let me read the paragraph:

> (g) In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident desiring to enter the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges, and shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of section 3 of such act which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage by corporations, foreign government, or others; and any such resident shall be admitted to perform agricultural labor in the United States for such time and under such conditions (but not including the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States) as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General; and in the event such regulations require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident which he is unable to furnish, such requirement may be waived by the admitting officer of the United States at the point where such resident seeks entry into the United States if such official has other proof satisfactory to him that such resident is a native of the country claimed as his birthplace.

I think all Senators will agree that the last phrase I just read substantiates what I said about the great difficulty of obtaining any dependable proof that persons coming in under this act are or are not native-born residents of the country concerned.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Would not that particular paragraph practically set aside the provisions of the quota law, if the persons concerned were native-born residents of a country whose quota had been filled, and if they made application to come into the United States?

Mr. LODGE. The purpose is to avoid, let us say, having hostile aliens go into the countries in question and then come into the United States. The requirement that the persons coming into the United States must be native-born residents of the country from which they desire to come is made for the purpose of avoiding the very danger of which the Senator from Pennsylvania speaks.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not see in the conference report anything which would prevent anyone who last week became a resident of one of the countries concerned from coming into the United States. The paragraph simply waives the payment of a head tax, as required by the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917. It would not prevent those who become residents of one of those countries last week from coming into the United States, if they pay the head tax. The paragraph does not prohibit them from coming in at all, as I see it.

Mr. LODGE. That is true. It lifts certain restrictions with regard to entry into the United States of native-born residents of those countries.

Mr. AIKEN. And it gives those persons certain advantages over those who have recently become residents.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has stated that the purpose is to keep out alien enemies and saboteurs. I am also in favor at this time of keeping out another class—refugees from Europe. We may as well be frank about that.

The language used in the conference report provides that anyone who begins residence in one of the countries referred to may come into this country. The word "native" is not used. It has been my hope that when the measure went to conference that subject would be taken care of. Does the Senator think the present language meets that situation?

Mr. LODGE. I think there was a sincere desire to meet it, but I question whether the language used does meet it.

There were three further steps which could have been taken to improve this language so that it would mean exactly what I think all Senators want it to mean. In the first place, provision is made that the regulations are to be prescribed with the approval of the Attorney General. I think that provision could have been amended so as also to include the approval of the Secretary of War and of the Secretary of the Navy, who, under our system, have a prime responsibility for preventing sabotage and for directing antisabotage. If they were given a hand in drafting the regulations and in the administration of the act, we would have an added assurance that the act would not be used as a means for the entrance of saboteurs. That, however, was not done.

Another improvement which I think could have been incorporated would have been to set a definite numerical limitation on the number of persons who may be admitted under the terms of the proposed act. We could have set the limitation at whatever figure is needed to harvest the crop; but that was not done.

A third step which I think would have been desirable would have been to require that a report to Congress be made of all admissions under the authority of this language but that was not done. As I say, I think the measure reported by the conference is a great improvement over its predecessors; but, as I have tried to indicate to the Senate, it leaves a great deal to be desired.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Can the Senator give us any statistical information as to the number of residents of other countries who are now in countries bordering the United States?

Mr. LODGE. No; we did not go into that subject.

Mr. DAVIS. As I understand, it has been estimated that about 250,000 of them are in Canada, Cuba, Mexico, and the South American countries.

Mr. LODGE. We did not go into that question.

Mr. DAVIS. Under the terms of the proposed act, they could make application to enter the United States.

Mr. LODGE. A great deal depends on how the law is administered. I wish to be fair about it. Much is left to the discretion of the officials who are to enforce the law. The intent of those who drafted the language was to confine admissions entirely to bona fide farm workers and to prevent, so far as possible, the entrance of hostile alien saboteurs. I

think a few more precautions could have been taken.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Section 4 (a) of the joint resolution requires the consent in writing of the county extension agent before farm labor may be moved from one county to another. Did the conferees feel that that question came within their province and was consideration given to it?

Mr. LODGE. I believe the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] can answer that question better than I can. My impression of the joint resolution is that it will not be of great help to agriculture so far as moving farmers from one part of the United States to another is concerned. That is my general impression, but I shall be glad to have the Senator from Georgia answer that question, and make any additional observations he may care to make.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the fair statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts regarding the joint resolution. I certainly agree with him that the conference report is infinitely preferable to the House measure or the measure as passed by the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts, as a member of the conference committee, will recall that the section requiring the approval of the county agent was subject to very bitter controversy within the conference. It was discussed at considerable length. The Senate language had modified the House measure to a very definite extent. The original House measure required the approval of the county agent before any laborer could be taken from one county to another with the funds provided in the joint resolution. It not only provided for approval by the county agent before any funds could be employed to pay the transportation of any laborer from one county to another, but also required that the commissioner of agriculture of any State, or the equivalent officer of such State, file a written approval before any laborer could be moved beyond the confines of the State where he was located. The Senate committee struck out the latter provision, requiring the approval of the Commissioner of Agriculture. It also modified the language requiring the approval of the county agent by limiting it to workers who had resided in the county for a period of 1 year or more, and who had continuously for that year been engaged in agricultural employment.

The Senate committee further provided for the right of appeal from any decision of the county agent to the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution.

In the conference the House conferees, without exception, and without regard to party affiliation, were adamant in their insistence on the provisions of the House text, and the provision of the conference report represents a compromise, as is usually the case when there is a wide divergence of opinion between the conferees on the part of the two bodies.

In the opinion of the Senate conferees, the Senate language, which excluded laborers who had not been continuously employed for more than 1 year in agricultural pursuits within the county would eliminate all the migratory labor which has heretofore formerly been engaged in movements from crop to crop as they mature throughout the country. The Senator from Vermont knows that approximately half a million persons engaged in seasonal agricultural labor have constantly moved from State to State and from county to county.

There is nothing in the provisions of the joint resolution which would prohibit the use of the funds provided to pay the transportation of those who have heretofore been migratory laborers. It would, however, give the county agents the right of approval or disapproval of the removal of a farm laborer who had been continuously engaged in agricultural pursuits within a specific county for a period of more than 1 year.

I realize that there are a great many objections to that provision; and as a member of the Senate conferees I supported the Senate provision, allowing an appeal by any party who was affected or interested; but there is something to be said in support of the position of the House. Some of the House conferees have had some very unhappy experiences in their districts in the pirating of farm labor, as they call it. It seems that those who had engaged in recruiting the labor had, by offering unusually attractive wages, seduced from their employment those who were under contract for a year or more, or those who were engaged as tenant farmers, and had caused considerable disruption of the farming activities within the counties where the labor was located.

The conference report is a compromise. It is not absolutely pleasing to the Senate conferees. The House conferees, of course, insisted on all of the House language. I do not think the measure as reported by the conferees would impede the movement, with the funds provided in the joint resolution, of any of those who have heretofore been migrants and have been engaged in traveling from place to place to gather crops or do other agricultural work.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator for an interpretation at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand what the Senator says about the meaning of section 4, the phrase "if such worker has resided in such county for a period of 1 year or more immediately prior thereto" refers to a continuous year.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is my construction of that language that this provision would affect only those who had not been residents of the county and continuously engaged in agricultural employment for a period of more than 12 months prior to the time the recruitment takes place.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator; and I hope we may rely upon that interpretation as being authentic.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. O'MAHONEY addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia, after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the Senator will recall the discussions which were had with respect to those who might be brought into this country under the terms of the joint resolution. With respect to subsection (g) of section 5, on page 4, will the able Senator from Georgia advise us whether or not in his opinion only native-born persons could be brought in under the terms of the joint resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is perfectly clear to me that under the provisions of the joint resolution only native-born residents of American countries may be brought in. I could not clearly understand the Senator from West Virginia, but I was rather surprised to hear him express a contrary view in his questioning of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The language of subsection (g), in the second line, is as follows: "of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto."

Wherever, in other provisions of this section, there is reference to such residents, it certainly all relates back to the original description of native-born residents. There is no question to my mind that the joint resolution relates only to native-born citizens.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, that was the understanding, I believe, of every member of the conference.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It no doubt was the intent, but does the language of the joint resolution as agreed to in conference accomplish the purpose?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, I think so, unquestionably; all the conferees thought so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Paragraph (g) reads as follows:

> In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it has never been the custom since I have been in the Senate after describing a certain class of individuals to continue to spell out the entire description throughout the language of a measure. It would make the legislation rather cumbersome to say in 8 or 10 places in a short subsection:

> Any such native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto.

It would certainly be reiteration to the very highest degree. As I understand the rule, unless exception be specifically made the definition first made prevails throughout the entire para-

graph, and throughout the entire legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is especially so in this case because the law as it now stands prohibits other nationals from coming in.

Mr. RUSSELL. For that reason, the words "such resident" whenever they are employed were used to refer back to "residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then it is quite certain that the intent of the joint resolution is that it shall apply only to native-born residents.

Mr. RUSSELL. So far as the congressional intent is concerned, that was certainly the intent of the conferees and of the House. It was so stated during the debate on the floor of the House. I had occasion to read the RECORD this morning. It was also the intention of the Senate conferees. I do not believe the language permits of any other construction, but the congressional intent is clearly to confine admission to those who are native-born residents of the Americas.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to again return to section 4 (a). Will not the practical effect of this section be to freeze farm labor where it now is with the exception of the migratory or floating labor? As there is now no farm-labor surplus in any county, I cannot conceive of a county agent giving his written consent to the removal of any laborer from his county to another county, say 50 miles away, even though the county 50 miles away might be in desperate need of labor for harvesting. So, will not the effect of this section be to freeze farm labor, and particularly the lower paid farm labor, where it now is?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not know that a difference in the degree of pay received by the laborer would make any difference. As I understand, the limitation relates to the use of the funds appropriated. It does not attempt to hold any person in a county. Some of the House conferees contended that any person could walk across the county line 2 feet into another county, and the county agent of the county where he had been residing would have no jurisdiction over him, and would not be required to certify that he could be spared from that county before he could be moved.

I wish to be perfectly frank with the Senator from Vermont, and say that it was undoubtedly the intention of the House conferees, all of whom said they had no surplus labor in their districts, to retain permanently their own farm labor to the extent required in their respective counties. That was undoubtedly the intention.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has said there is nothing in the measure which would prevent a laborer from walking across the county line into another county where there existed a greater demand for labor at higher prices. That is the trouble. He would have to walk, because the only labor available to move is the labor which does not have the price to pay for carfare or any other method of transportation to the county where labor is more sorely needed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may answer the Senator from actual experience; take my own county of Shelby, Tenn., which is near the junction of two or three States. During certain periods such as strawberry picking time, and cotton-picking time, thousands of laborers have for many years gone to Mississippi and Arkansas, and other portions of Tennessee to help gather crops, and will continue to do so after this law is enacted.

Mr. AIKEN. In those instances is not their transportation paid by the man who hires them?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before propounding my question, I may say that the more I read section 4 (a) the more remarkable the legislation appears to me to be. That is particularly true since I have listened to the remarks of the Senator from Georgia in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Vermont, when he said that an agricultural worker in a county may cross the county line and thereby escape the provision written into section 4 by the House for the purpose of preventing a worker leaving the county.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had started to say that the House objected to striking out that portion of the language relating to approval by the State commissioner of agriculture on the ground that the laborer or any other person might walk out of the county and thereby remove himself from jurisdiction. I did not make the statement as an argument for or against the proposed legislation. I was undertaking to explain some of the difficulties we encountered in the conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood what the Senator was stating, but am I correct in understanding that the prohibition contained in the provision against the transportation of workers outside a county without the written consent of the county agent may be avoided by a worker by the simple expedient of stepping across the county line? If so, my objections to the provision have been largely eliminated.

Mr. RUSSELL. I doubt very seriously whether it would have that effect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If that is the construction to be placed upon it then the House is certainly not getting what it thought it was getting.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the worker crosses the county line the employment in the county he leaves ceases, and jurisdiction will be transferred from the county of residence to the county where he is working. So if he should cross the county line and engage in agricultural employment across the county line, I think he would relieve himself of the necessity of obtaining approval of the agent of the county wherein he had resided.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator is mistaken in the new opinion which he has stated with respect to this matter. May I read the section to which I have reference?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be very happy to have the Senator read it. I have read it several times, but I always enjoy hearing the Senator from Wyoming read.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator from Georgia has read the section 150 times, if not more, because I know he had a great deal to do with drafting it.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I will state to the Senator from Wyoming that I had nothing to do with its drafting. It came to us from the House; it is wholly the idea of the House and a part of the House joint resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When I said that I thought the Senator from Georgia had something to do with drafting it, I had in mind that the Senate committee rewrote the House language. The provision is very different from that which originally came to us from the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the main, section 4 is a part of the language originally contained in the House joint resolution, with a modifying provision in the last three lines of the section.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As it comes to us from the conference it provides as follows:

> No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working—

That means clearly that he may or may not be a resident of the county. I will repeat:

> No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county—

That means the county where he resides, or the county where he is working—

> without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county—

That is either county, and therefore either extension agent—

> if such worker has resided in such county for a period of 1 year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period.

The question I desire to ask the Senator from Georgia is this: If an agricultural worker is working in a county in which he has not resided for 1 year or more immediately prior thereto and has not been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation for that year, does the prohibition of the law apply?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is the intent that the prohibition of the law shall not apply in such case.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is right. So it is clear, then, that if the worker crosses the county line into a county in which he has not been a resident for a year, the funds may be used to transport him? I think there can be no doubt about that, and it pleases me very much.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am inclined to agree with the construction of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the law will be so administered, because, as the measure was originally drafted, the intent clearly was to prevent workers moving from one county to another or outside a State without the consent in writing of the county agent, but there is now nothing in the joint resolution which prescribes the standard that shall guide a county agent. He may refuse his consent for any reason satisfactory to him. That means, Mr. President, that the Congress, in the circumstances, would have been delegating to a county agent the discretion to determine how the funds of the United States should be expended for the purpose of providing agricultural labor.

In the Senate committee we were much concerned about this matter, lest the county agents should have the right to obstruct the transportation of workers that we wrote in a provision for an appeal. The Senator from Georgia, when the joint resolution was before the Senate for consideration, pointed, with a good deal of satisfaction, and justly so, to that provision. I want the Senate to know that it has been stricken from the joint resolution. It is as follows:

Provided, That upon the refusal of the county extension agent to give his consent in any such case, any interested or affected person may appeal to the Administrator, and the Administrator may permit the expenditure of such funds for the transportation of such worker from such county if the Administrator finds that the services of such worker can be more effectively utilized in another place of employment.

The purpose of that provision was to give the Administrator power to overrule an unjust and indiscriminate action of a county agent in preventing the transportation of workers who were available for transportation; but the conferees have stricken out that proviso and the Senate conferees have agreed to its elimination.

I was very much disturbed by it, but in view of the interpretation of the remaining language upon which the Senator from Georgia and I now agree, that a worker by crossing the county line may escape the prohibition of the county agent and may then be transported to work, of course I have no objection to the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. OVERTON addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, first, to the Senator from West Virginia, and then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me inquire whether there is any provision for having the imported laborers returned to their homes?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; there is such a provision.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is there any requirement to that effect?

Mr. RUSSELL. I consider it to be a requirement.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Where is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator will observe the language of the latter part of subsection (g) of section 5, as follows:

Any such resident admitted under the foregoing provisions who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission shall be taken into custody under a warrant issued by the Attorney General at any time after entry and deported in accordance with section 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917.

The joint resolution, by its express terms, expires on the 30th day of December, unless there be a continuing resolution, and it is my construction that the imported laborers will be subject to deportation at any time after the 30th day of December 1943, unless the Congress shall extend the legislation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator think that under the language just quoted the agricultural laborers could be deported and required to leave the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is certainly the intention of the Senate conferees that when the imported laborers shall have performed the tasks for which they were imported they shall forthwith and immediately be returned to the country of their origin. If they do not return voluntarily under the terms of the joint resolution, with transportation paid for them as is provided herein, it would then be the duty of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to pick these people up and deport them, as they would any other aliens who were in this country illegally.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I promised to yield to the Senator from Louisiana, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I desire to make the observation that I have some doubt that the interpretation placed on section 4 (a) by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and concurred in by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], is a correct interpretation. The limitation upon the expenditure of the Federal funds relates to a certain class of agricultural workers—namely, those who have been continuously engaged in agricultural work in a county for a period of 1 year or more. That is the classification to which the limitation and the expenditure of the Federal funds applies. So that, whenever an agent of the Government who has the authority to employ these funds for the transportation of any worker undertakes to do so he is required, as I interpret the provision, to inquire whether the individual has been engaged in agricultural work, and, if so, in what county; and if he finds he has been engaged in a certain county for a year immediately preceding the time when he undertakes to transfer him to engage in agricultural work in that county, then he must go to the county agent before he can use Federal funds to transport the worker. He must go to the county agent where the agricultural worker has resided. Of course, it would be a mere subterfuge for the agricultural worker to step beyond the bounds of a county and say, "I am free from the limitation that Congress has placed upon my transportation to other fields of agricultural work; I have freed myself, and I have a right to demand that the funds of the Federal Government be employed to transport me, because I have kept from without the jurisdiction of the county agent, who is clothed with jurisdiction under the provisions of this section; I have stepped outside the county some 2 or 3 feet, and here I am, Mr. Uncle Sam, transport me from Georgia to North Dakota."

Mr. President, clearly it is the intention of this provision that the limitation shall apply to a classification, and that classification is workers who have been continuously engaged in agricultural work in any county for a period of a year, and they are subject to the jurisdiction of such county agent so far as the administration of these funds is concerned.

Mr. REVERCOMB rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me that I may make a comment on what has just been said by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt that what the Senator from Louisiana has just said was the intention of those who originally drafted this provision in the House, but it is clear that they did not state that intention in this language, because we have the distributive word "or" there, in undertaking to clothe the county agent with the discretion to refuse the right to transportation. Let me call the attention to the Senate again to this language:

No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working.

That means clearly from the county where he resides or from the county where he is working. There can be no other interpretation of it. I am emphasizing this because I want it clear that the purpose which the drafters of the House provision had in mind is not being carried out in the language now before the Senate, and I am happy it is not being carried out, for I think it would be outrageous to appropriate millions of dollars and then say that a county agent in some county may, by his mere wish, prevent the farmers of this country from obtaining the workers they need and should have, and whom the Congress of the United States is trying to make provision they should have.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. To start with, there is no intention on the part of Congress, in adopting the conference report, to prohibit any farm laborer from going anywhere in the United States where he desires to work. He can pay his own way, he can go voluntarily, and anyone in the United States who desires the services of such a farm laborer may pay his transportation. No effort is made to create a condition of involuntary servitude, but it is provided merely that the funds of the Federal Government may not be used to transport such a worker

unless a certain condition has been complied with, and the condition, which the able Senator from Wyoming did not read, is that "if such worker has resided in such county for a period of 1 year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period." That is a controlling condition in this particular provision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may have the indulgence of the Senator from Georgia for another moment, let me say that I did read that clause. I am very glad the Senator has called attention to it, because it is that clause, in connection with the distributive word in the first part of the paragraph, which makes it clear that the county agent of the county in which the worker is working has no authority to prohibit his leaving if he has not worked in that county for a year.

Mr. President, I merely desire to emphasize, for the benefit of those who are to administer the law, that the barrier which was sought to be erected between the farmers of the United States and necessary workers in other parts of the United States has not been erected. Statutes must be interpreted, not by what the draftsman intended, but by what the draftsman said, particularly when in a situation such as the present it is clearly pointed out on the floor of the Senate what the language means.

If this language meant anything else, I should say that the report should be rejected, I should say that the joint resolution should be vetoed if passed, because to my way of thinking it is perfectly outrageous to convey to a county agent the unregulated and unrestrained authority to prevent workers who need transportation and who need jobs from obtaining transportation in order to get the jobs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. After hearing the discussion, I must say that I am somewhat confused. I thought the purpose of section 4 (a) was to give the county authority the right to retain in the county agricultural workers. Am I wrong in that, I ask the Senator from Georgia or the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There can be no doubt, if I may answer the Senator from Louisiana, that those who drafted the measure in the House had that objective clearly in mind, and that is why some of us in the Senate called it the peonage amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the proposed law could be so easily thwarted, that is, by one crossing the county line, I do not see why we should adopt that provision at all. It should be stricken out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me now?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The discussion of section 4 (a) has been very interesting, but let us return to the subject of having the laborers who are brought into the United States taken back to their countries of origin.

I believe the Senator from Georgia has expressed the view that the language contained in the last paragraph of the bill meets that situation. I wish to call attention to that language. It reads:

> Any such resident admitted under the foregoing provisions, who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission—

And so forth. Who fixes the terms of his admission? Who creates the status for which he was admitted? Provision is to be found in the same paragraph, as follows:

> shall be admitted to perform agricultural labor in the United States for such time and under such conditions (but not including the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States) as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General.

In other words, the proposed law does not fix the terms under which such a person shall enter; it does not say when he must leave, the law says that the Commissioner of Immigration max fix the terms and may create his status in this country.

What is to prevent the Commissioner of Immigration from admitting such a foreigner on such terms that he may stay here as long as he pleases? What I am afraid of is that if such people may come here while needed, and the Commissioner of Immigration permits them to stay longer without any limitation upon their time, when the war is over they will not leave. What work will such a man go into, or what employment will he seek? I am thinking about our own men who are out of the country at this time, and who will return.

I submit that under the proposed law the Commissioner of Immigration would be given the power to fix the time such person could stay in this country, that the Commissioner of Immigration is to fix his status, and that he must comply only with such terms as may be fixed by the Commissioner of Immigration. That is the way I read the language, and if I am wrong, I should be very glad to be set right.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I certainly hope the Senator is in error in his construction. Certainly the person who drafted the provision had no such intent. If I understand the language, there are a number of very definite limitations. In the first place, it refers to those "desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States during continuation of hostilities in the present war." Not only would such immigrants be confined to agricultural labor, but they would be very definitely confined to the period of hostilities of the present war.

That is a specific limitation. Upon the conclusion of the war each and every one of these persons will be subject to immediate deportation. We cannot write legislation which will guarantee that whoever may be Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization will do his duty, but certainly I think we have the right to assume that every public official will attempt to carry out the will of the Congress, and to enforce the laws passed by Congress relating to immigration.

There is another limitation. The Senator from West Virginia has stated that there is no assurance that these persons will not transfer from agricultural labor to other employment. I was impressed when the Senator raised that question when the bill was before the Senate previously. Certainly it is clear from three or four phrases in subsection (g) of section 5, that the moment one of these aliens leaves agricultural employment he shall be immediately deported to the country of his origin. There can be no question about that, because it says the alien shall be imported only to perform agricultural labor. Further on in the subsection it is provided that any alien who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted shall be deported. What is the status? For agricultural labor within the United States? If he fails to maintain his status of an agricultural laborer the clear mandate of this subsection, in which the Congress speaks to the Commissioner, is that the Commissioner shall deport him forthwith, and the rules and regulations which the Commissioner might make certainly cannot supersede the clearly expressed will of Congress in that matter. If persons brought into this country cease to perform agricultural labor, if they fail to comply with the terms of their admission, if they stay here after the cessation of hostilities, they are immediately to be deported.

Not only that, Mr. President, but these persons are brought into the United States under a contract or agreement which has been entered into with the Government of Mexico, let us say, or with the Government of the Bahama Islands. The contract or agreement specifically provides that they are to perform agricultural labor, and agricultural labor only, and that they are to be deported from this country at such time as the proper agency of the Government determines that they should leave the country. I do not think Congress can afford to say that these persons shall stay in the United States for not more than 3 months, or 6 months. We do in fact say that they shall stay only during the present war; that when hostilities cease they shall be deported. We say that they must engage in agricultural labor, and if they change to any other form of labor they shall be deported.

Perhaps the section is not as clear as it might be, but to my mind it is sufficiently clear. I want Senators to bear in mind that in discussing the question of foreign labor we are discussing one of the smallest phases of this entire matter. I doubt very seriously if in any event more than 25,000 to 30,000 foreigners will come into this country under the terms of this measure. In years past, before the recent change of government in Mexico, it was not at all uncommon in any one season for tens of thousands of Mexicans to come across the border and to engage in agricultural employment. Such legislation as that proposed would not be necessary under the old order. Before the present administration of the Government of Mexico was established,

tens of thousands of Mexican laborers were brought across the border and engaged in agricultural labor in this country. No question with respect to such laborers was raised under that old procedure. Now it is necessary to enter into a contract with respect to foreign labor. Now it is necessary to have the consent of the Mexican Government. Now it is necessary to have funds provided with which to pay for the transportation of this labor, and to pay for its recruitment.

In my judgment, Mr. President, we are not going to have a great flood of foreign labor under the provisions of this measure. As a matter of fact, in my judgment, the farmers in the Southwest will not receive as many foreign laborers as they were accustomed to receive under the old order, when not one dime was paid for the transportation or recruitment of the labor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may state further that these persons are to be admitted under an agreement with the Government of Mexico, and if they violate the terms of that agreement, or if they fail to maintain the status for which they are admitted, or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of their admission, they shall be taken into custody under a warrant issued by the Attorney General. A direction to the Attorney General is provided to issue a warrant against such persons, and to deport them.

INCREASE IN OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE TO NEEDY INDIVIDUALS DURING THE WAR

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, during this time of serious war crisis many perplexing domestic problems confront the Nation. We have the wage problem, and wages have been increased in many lines of industry to enable wage earners to cope with the increased cost of living. We have the farm problem, and prices on some farm commodities have been advanced to enable farmers and ranchers to cope with their increased cost of production. We have the Government-employee problem, and legislation has recently been enacted increasing salaries and wages of Government employees to enable them to cope with the increased cost of living. These actions on the part of Congress and other departments of our Government bear indisputable evidence that the cost of living has materially increased.

Let us consider another class of people in the Nation who are vitally affected by the increased cost of living. I refer to the class of people which our Nation has, by constitutional amendments, statutes, and popular opinion, declared to be entitled to old-age assistance. I do not intend to go into the whole subject of old-age pensions, because that philosophy of handling public welfare has been fully discussed and finally adopted by this Nation. I am going to discuss altering payments under the plan to enable old-age pension recipients to meet the general increase in the cost of living due to the war. These old-age pension recipients, due to the increased cost of living on account of the war, find themselves adversely affected to a dangerous degree by three factors:

First. Many of these old folks have sons, daughters, or other relatives who were contributing to their support, who are now serving in the military forces of our Nation and who because of their low pay are unable to make much, if any, contribution to their support. Of perhaps greater importance, their absence also deprives these old folks of the tender touch of a loving hand; therefore all nursing and personal care must be by nonrelatives who in most cases expect pay for their services, thus adding to the cost of living.

Second. The cost of food, clothing, shelter, and medicine has increased to these old folks to the same degree, or more, than it has increased to those who have had their salaries and wages increased. It must also be born in mind that the diet of these old folks in most cases was reduced long ago to the plainest and cheapest food items. Therefore, they cannot reduce the cost of living by cutting out choice and fancy foods, because their income has not been sufficient to permit them to enjoy those luxuries. The only way these old folks can reduce their cost of food is to eat less of the least-expensive foods, and it will be very difficult for them to do that and properly sustain their body and strength.

Third. In many States, if not all of them, the revenue for paying pensions has been greatly decreased by gasoline rationing and other causes incident to the war, and the decrease in State revenue for this purpose has resulted in a reduction in old-age pensions of just twice that amount because of the Federal money-matching plan now being used.

Thus it will be seen, Mr. President, that the old folks of the Nation face an immediate dire emergency. In many instances they are suffering untold hardships due to the lack of the bare necessities of life. Their problem needs immediate consideration by Congress. The States are helpless to remedy the situation because their revenues in many cases have shrunk, and few States feel they could impose further State taxes on their citizens in addition to the burdensome Federal taxes which have been so greatly increased during this war. I believe it is also quite generally recognized that our war effort is a national task and not a State task. The present alarming situation, which is adversely affecting the welfare of our aged citizens, has been brought on almost entirely by the war; therefore, it should be dealt with as a national problem and solved by out Federal Government.

I am fully aware of the fact that it will require more money to solve this pressing problem. I am fully aware of the staggering tax burden now being carried by our people. I am equally alarmed about our enormous and rapidly-increasing national debt. I realize that if we are to remain solvent as a Nation we must reverse our present course and must inaugurate a program of reducing our national debt. That reversed course can only be accomplished by having our Government adopt a policy of spending less than it receives. In the case of normal domestic activities, I am ready and willing to adopt that new policy right now, provided it is applied on the whole domestic front, not piecemeal to only a few of our Federal departments and activities. Until the Congress is ready to launch a general campaign to reduce expenditures for domestic purposes equally and proportionately in every field of endeavor, I shall insist that our old folks and other needy classes of our people be treated more in line with the treatment accorded the favored classes.

Certainly, the proper way to start economizing is not by denying food, clothing, medicine, shelter, and care to our old folks, many of whom are right at the particular time in their lives when they need such necessities more than ever before. It is sad, indeed, and very unfortunate that they have reached the declining years of their lives, and are approaching the sunset in so helpless a condition; and nobody realizes how unhappy that condition is more than do the old folks themselves. But we are learning from this terrible war, in which the life of our Nation is at stake, that there is something more important than money. Money is necessary, of course, but money alone will not win this war. Men are required in order to win this war—big men, strong men, patriotic and self-sacrificing men, men who can and will face the enemy on the seven seas, on every continent, and in the air, and fight him and subdue him. The noble pioneers for whom I am today seeking justice, produced many of the brave, strong, patriotic, self-sacrificing men who are fighting our war. Many of our fighting men are sons and grandsons of those noble pioneers. Yes, it is true they made and saved little money, but they produced brave fighting men, who today are of more value to America than is money. Can we lightly brush aside their meager requests, and permit them to suffer during their declining years?

They have skimped and denied themselves many things they really needed, and have waited patiently, while almost every other class of our people has been cared for. But now necessity has forced them to ask for an adjustment in order that they may live on the basis of decency and respectability that the people of our great Nation intended they should enjoy.

Mr. President, partially to solve this pressing and important problem, I propose that throughout this Nation for the duration of the war we freeze old-age pensions at the top monthly figure for each individual during the past 12 months, plus 25 percent. I propose that monthly pensions be calculated on that basis, and paid on that basis. I propose that the funds for paying the pensions be provided by having each State contribute the maximum revenue currently collected or otherwise provided for that purpose under present State laws, and by having the Federal Government contribute the balance. I realize, Mr. President, that this proposal does not settle the old-age-pension problem permanently, but it is intended to give some im-

WICHITA, KANS., *April 10, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

May I urge that you attend the hearing of the committee on crude-oil requirements before the Patman committee on small business on April 14? I believe the price of crude most important and pertinent to present situation. I believe that the petroleum industry cannot replace this natural resource at present cost of production. The price structure should be reviewed in the interest of our wartime needs and with fair treatment to producer. To increase production from present Kansas wells will unquestionably result in waste of crude.

A. W. KINCADE,
President, Fourth National Bank.

WICHITA, KANS., *April 10, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to the hearing before the Patman committee on small business, which is scheduled for April 14, to consider the problems of the independent oil producer in Kansas:

Kansas is producing all the oil the State can produce without waste and to justify more wildcatting and development, due to the shortage of manpower and the cost of operation, it is very important that we should have an increase in the price of oil.

Your earnest support of our problem would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

SOLAR OIL CORPORATION,
JAMES DAVIS.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *April 12, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

It is impossible for the small oil operator to continue operating or do any developing at the present price of crude oil while operating costs have advanced 30 to 60 percent and no advance in price of crude oil.

R. E. YOUKER.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks a statement made yesterday before the House Committee on Small Business by E. B. Shawver, president of the Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association. It sets forth the facts as to the critical oil situation clearly and correctly.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am E. B. Shawver, of Wichita, Kans., independent oil producer and president of the Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association. I have been producing oil for 28 years—during that time I have drilled hundreds of wells and have discovered a number of new pools.

I own and operate over 150 wells—most of them are small and stripper wells, average depth over 3,000 feet. From 1934 to 1942, inclusive, I produced 5,869,722 barrels of oil gross. My average cost of lifting that oil, which includes labor costs for pumpers, roustabouts, repairs, fuel, etc., was 0.3814 per barrel. The cost increased from 0.2825 in 1934 to 0.5306 in 1942. This is for producing oil, only.

My average cost, combined of exploration, developing and producing this oil over this period of time—1934 to 1942—has been $1.205 per barrel. This does not include any salary for officers. I am the only officer—and draw no salary.

The only reason I have been able to stay in the business was on account of my depletion credits.

Now I want to explain to you my operation in the past 2 years on my wildcat and semiwildcat wells. The costs I quote here are the actual costs to me—drilling with my own tools, no depreciation: In 1941–42, drilled in wildcats and semiwildcats, as follows:

10 producing wells, total cost	$203,497.63
12 dry holes	98,916.82
Total for development	302,414.45

I estimated the recoverable oil from these 10 wells as follows: 405,000 barrels; less the one-eighth royalty, 50,625 barrels; total, 354,375 barrels at $1.17 equals $414,681.75.

Lifting cost over life of lease at 53 cents per barrel	$188,031.38
Development cost	302,414.45
Total cost	490,445.83
Total sales of crude oil	414,681.75
Total loss	75,764.08

These are the records as shown by my books—I have a copy of the records and will be glad to file it if you so desire.

Under these conditions it is impossible for me to continue, as I cannot possibly operate at a profit. In 1941–42 I sold 1,286,840.91 barrels of oil, gross, and discovered in this period 405,000 barrels of oil, gross—so I depleted my reserves over a 2-year period, 880,840.71 barrels. To continue on this basis means only one thing—failure. Therefore I have decided to quit the oil business. I know something about farming and ranching. I am going to do my part in helping win this war by producing food and raising livestock.

In all my experience in 28 years producing oil I have never seen conditions like they are today. I have seen the time I could not find a market for my oil, and have sold oil for $4 per barrel. I have sold oil as low as 13 cents per barrel at a greater loss than we are taking today, but in those days I always had in mind the fact that supply and demand controlled the price. That is not true today. We have refiners in our State shut down one-half the time for the want of crude oil. They would be willing to pay a premium for oil if they could get it, but it cannot be had.

Now, I do not want to be misunderstood. We independent producers are not asking for an increase in prices for a personal financial gain only. You know if anyone makes large profits at this time it will go for taxes anyway. We have something else in mind—we can foresee a shortage of oil. In fact, we have a shortage now.

Here is the way I feel—if it costs more to produce the required number of tanks or planes to do the job—produce them at any cost. But what good are your tanks and planes without fuel to operate them? I don't want my boy or your boy or any other man's boy to return and say "Dad, we could have done the job sooner if we did not run out of gas," or he might even have to say "We lost the war because of a shortage of fuel."

RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. DAVIS obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we will not conclude today until all Senators have their speeches made, and it is desirable to pass on the conference report as soon as possible.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Senator yield to us so that the conference report may be agreed to?

Mr. DAVIS. There are others who desire to make long speeches on the conference report.

Mr. President, I rise again to speak about one of the most serious problems that confront the citizens of western Pennsylvania—namely, the hardships and inefficiencies occasioned by the gasoline-rationing policy which prevails in that area.

This area of western Pennsylvania represents a geographical unit completely separated from the eastern portion of the State. It represents, moreover, a most strategic war production area, and an area which makes a substantial contribution not only to its own economic development, but to the development of other areas as well. This region has been designated as a part of zone 1, under the gasoline rationing regulations—and this notwithstanding the fact that this region produces much more gasoline than it uses. Even so, however, those agencies charged with the administration of the gasoline-rationing program have not seen fit to remove western Pennsylvania from the restricted zone. And the continued adherence to this indefensible policy has brought about the following results:

First. A considerable amount of valuable machinery and productive equipment is lying idle, because of the fact that there are no further facilities available for the storage of excess gasoline and oil products which are produced in this region, the continued accumulation of which has completely overtaxed all available storage facilities. These products are not being shipped to any other regions, nor are they being used in any manner whatsoever.

Second. An inexcusable loss of manpower and productive employment has followed upon this first condition, for, with facilities already overtaxed, there is no possible way in which the continued operation of the gasoline refineries in this region can be achieved.

Third. A problem of unavoidable absenteeism in vital industries has been brought about because of the fact that the limited gasoline ration permitted in this area is not sufficient to meet the essential needs of a great number of industrial employees, many of whom must travel as much as 30 or 40 miles to and from their work each day. And since the public transportation systems are completely overtaxed and unable to provide necessary transportation in this area, many man-days of valuable time are lost in this region each week.

Fourth. Many lines of civilian enterprise in western Pennsylvania have been adversely affected by the fact that a larger gasoline allowance is permitted in the State of Ohio, just a few miles away. Shopping and other necessary civilian transactions have followed the gasoline trade into Ohio, with the result that a number of the merchants in western Pennsylvania are experiencing very difficult times.

Fifth. The war production effort in this region, as well as the civilian morale have been adversely affected by this policy. Necessary absenteeism, consequent upon insufficient gasoline allowances, has served to threaten the production output of many war production centers in this area. And civilian morale has been dealt a damaging blow because the citizens, themselves, can easily recognize the fact that this tringent gasoline rationing policy in western Pennsylvania is as unnecessary as it is unproductive.

The people of this region are sincere, hard-working, patriotic citizens; and if this gasoline were being transported and effectively used in other regions, or effectively used by our armed forces in the prosecution of the war, they would be the last to object; but the facts are otherwise. The gasoline is not being shipped. Facilities are lying idle. Men are not able to get to and from their work; and many merchants in this area have suffered considerable losses in their business by reason of the fact that gasoline allowances in Ohio are such that they will permit these citizens to go into that State and make many purchases, which have heretofore been made in western Pennsylvania.

While I have repeatedly called these matters to the attention of the Office of Price Administration, and the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator; and while a number of delegations have presented these same facts to these agencies, no adjustments have been forthcoming in this untenable gasoline rationing program in western Pennsylvania. I sincerely trust that Mr. Harold L. Ickes and Mr. Prentiss Brown will inquire into this matter more thoroughly, and come forward with the reasonable and sane adjustments which are so sorely needed in this particular area.

As an indication of the adverse conditions now being brought about by reason of this particular policy in western Pennsylvania, I wish to include as a part of my remarks a letter written me by Cornelius D. Scully, mayor of the city of Pittsburgh, together with a resolution adopted by the mayors and burgesses of the cities and towns of western Pennsylvania. The resolution sets forth in some detail the grievous conditions which now exist in western Pennsylvania, by reason of the present gasoline-rationing policy prevailing in that area. I sincerely hope that this resolution and the conditions which it points out will be carefully reviewed by the administrative agencies concerned; and that the righteous adjustments, which the Representatives of this district seek, will be forthcoming at an early date.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF PITTSBURGH, *April 8, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Member of United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Herewith please find copy of resolution passed at a meeting of mayors and burgesses of the cities and towns of western Pennsylvania held in this office on Wednesday, April 7, with reference to the exclusion of western Pennsylvania from district 2. Your cooperation in bringing about the objective of this resolution will be appreciated.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

CORNELIUS D. SCULLY,
Mayor, City of Pittsburgh.

Whereas the mayors and burgesses of the cities and towns of western Pennsylvania wish to do everything in their power to aid the war effort and fully realize that unnecessary controversy does not so aid, but in order to properly represent the people of their communities, must protest discrimination shown when West Virginia and four Pennsylvania communities are granted gasoline rations exceeding those extended to their citizens; and

Whereas in this time of crisis the 26 counties in western Pennsylvania here represented are together one of the most vital war industry areas in the United States with 90 percent of all industry engaged in production of material of war; and

Whereas the transportation systems of this area are taxed to the point where serious break-down is threatened, and this situation continues to grow worse with the erection of new war plants and the introduction of additional war workers where public transportation facilities are already inadequate; and

Whereas this area is the principal producing area of Pennsylvania grade crude oil, with production five times that of West Virginia; and

Whereas this area forms an economic unit in conjunction with northern West Virginia, eastern Ohio, and portions of Maryland and is separated economically and geographically from the remaining portion of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas the counties of western New York State formerly included in the buffer zone have appeared and asked to be included; and

Whereas assurances have been had from the Office of the Petroleum Administrator that he would reconsider the decision heretofore made, placing the 26 counties into district 1; and

Whereas we had been previously informed that it is administratively impossible to cross State lines in establishing ration districts, this has now been done by putting the cities of Sharon and Farrel and the boroughs of Sharpsville and Wheatland into district two, and has therefore eliminated what has been one of the strongest arguments advanced by the officials of the Office of Petroleum Administrator, and is a clear discrimination against other Western Pennsylvania communities equally engaged in war industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the assembled mayors and burgesses, representing two and one-half millions of people, in communities whose war plants produce 40 percent of the steel which is going into our war effort, and large percentages of electrical and other equipment, present most respectfully to the Petroleum Administrator and to the Office of Price Administration the necessity and propriety of their personally reviewing the situation to the end that promptly, and in the interest of efficient and successful war production, and in the interest of maintaining morale and public confidence, this group of counties may be placed in District Two; Be it further

Resolved, That the executive committee be empowered and instructed to do everything within its power to accomplish the purposes of this resolution, including transmittal of the Resolution to the Senators and Congressmen from the area represented, and through such agencies as the United States Conference of Mayors, and through communications and interviews with all Federal officers concerned.

REGISTRANTS FOR GAS CONFERENCE

MAYORS OF WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

Cornelius D. Scully, Pittsburgh, Pa.; John O'Connell, Jeannette, Pa.; R. E. Umber, Uniontown, Pa.; Charles B. Mayne, New Castle, Pa.; Charles R. Barbour, Erie, Pa.; Elmer J. Maloy, Duquesne, Pa.; J. G. Bollender, Franklin, Pa.; John A. Conway, Johnstown, Pa.; Hugh J. Ryan, Bradford, Pa.; Samuel A. Stroth, Jamestown, N. Y.; Dennis Mutschelier, Beaver Falls, Pa.; Henry S. Coshey, Greensburg, Pa.; Joseph Lescanac, Monessen, Pa.; W. M. Campbell, Butler, Pa.; Fred F. Whipple, Meadville, Pa.; P. J. Hoenig, Titusville, Pa.; J. G. Payne, Oil City, Pa.; W. C. Walley, New Kensington, Pa.; M. F. Horne, Arnold, Pa.; H. D. Minerd, Connellsville, Pa.; W. D. Brickermyer, Grove City, Pa.; J. Bradly Marble, Washington, Pa.; John J. Mullen, Clairton, Pa.; Lowell W. Munroe, borough manager, Ellwood City, Pa.

BURGESSES

P. J. Caul, Ambridge, Pa.; J. J. Gerneth, Verona, Pa.; W. R. Stopp, Oakmont, Pa.; J. Edward Manion, Carnegie, Pa.; Charles W. Ashton, McKees Rocks, Pa.; Emil Stritmatter, East Pittsburgh, Pa.; H. R. Rowland, Wilkinsburg, Pa.; R. M. Withington, Vandergrift, Pa.; Charles J. O'Laughlin, Aliquippa, Pa.; R. W. Steber, Warren, Pa.; Thomas G. Bishop, New Brighton, Pa.; J. R. Maloney, Indiana, Pa.; W. I. McInerney, Midland, Pa.; William Parkerstone, Stone Boro, Mercer County; John A. Wagner, Mt. Oliver; W. E. Llewellyn, Port Vue, Pa.; C. W. Homer, Greenville, Pa.; Dr. U. F. Higenbotham, Fayette City, Pa.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a letter on the same subject, gasoline rationing, which I received from Fred F. Whipple, mayor of the city of Meadville, Pa.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF MEADVILLE, PA.,
APRIL 12, 1943.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I feel that I would like to explain the meeting held last week in the city of Pittsburgh. At that time, we organized 52 cities and boroughs in western Pennsylvania for the period of the duration. This organization was formed for the self-preservation and welfare of our people. You know that there are no political representatives closer to the people than the mayors and burgesses of their respective communities and the people look to us in times of discomfort and trouble to aid them.

Why Mr. Ickes has placed us in the Atlantic seaboard, I don't know. That area has nothing in common with western Pennsylvania. We are separated from them by that sparsely populated area lying through the mountains and we are a part, both western Pennsylvania and eastern Ohio, of that great Shenango Valley industrial section. We have one county—McKean—that produces more crude oil than the entire State of West Virginia, yet they saw fit to place West Virginia in district No. 2.

In summing our case up, I believe we are justified in asking for the same rights and privileges and use of Pennsylvania gas that Ohioans enjoy with Pennsylvania gas.

I will be most interested to hear your reaction to the above letter. With very kindest personal regards, I am,

Respectfully,

FRED F. WHIPPLE,
Mayor.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96), making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to obtain an answer to a question

which is raised in the conference report; that is, why is it necessary that it contain on page 3, section 4, paragraph (b) a provision which prohibits any of the funds provided for in the joint resolution to be used directly or indirectly to impose minimum wages or housing standards? That language is very definite insofar as American citizens are concerned. Then further on it contains an exception for foreign citizens. I should like to have explained to me why it is desirable to have the measure contain a provision of that kind which would most certainly enunciate something like a legislative monstrosity. I yield to the Senator from Georgia for the purpose of making a reply.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I fear the Senator from Massachusetts has entirely misconstrued the theory of the measure. There is nothing on earth in it which prohibits the use of any part of the fund to house laborers who may be transported, or who may live in tourist camps, or in the camps which have been established by the Farm Security Administration. As a matter of fact the Senator will observe in section 2 (a) under subdivision (3) that the extension services are specifically authorized to lease, repair, alter, and operate labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services, including former Civilian Conservation Corps camps.

Practically the same language is found in the powers which are given the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution. The Senator from Massachusetts was in the conference committee, and of course he knows the facts concerning this language. It appears that an agency of Government, the Farm Security Administration, last year in moving some of these workers would not make them available to a farmer unless the farmer furnished certain housing facilities which in the opinion of the Farm Security Administration were adequate and were as they should be.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] read on the floor some testimony which was submitted to another committee of the Senate, showing that the Farm Security Administration in some of these matters had acted in a very arbitrary manner in regard to the housing facilities of migrant workers; that it had required housing conditions which were far superior to any that heretofore existed.

In the language to which the Senator from Massachusetts refers there is no limitation on the expenditure of the funds to provide housing facilities. It undertakes to prohibit the employees of any department of the Government from prescribing standards and making them a prerequisite to the importation or the placement of laborers on the farm. It has no relation to the expenditure of funds for housing, or the expenditure of funds for the payment of the farm workers. It undertakes only to prevent the practice which was followed last year by the Farm Security Administration in seizing upon the movement of agricultural migratory labor as the occasion to bring about what might be termed as some form of social reform in the condition of farm laborers.

The language, of course, does not draw any distinction, as the Senator seems to indicate, between the imported labor and the labor that is within the United States, except insofar as it is necessary to protect existing agreements with foreign countries. It so happens that the existing agreement with Mexico provides that certain housing standards shall be followed in protecting the laborers who are brought in from Mexico. The committee thought there ought to be an exception in that case, and that the Congress ought not to undertake to repeal an agreement which a sister republic, a good neighbor, had entered into in entire good faith.

It also, I may say, provides that provision can be made as to the rate of pay and as to the shelter of the American citizens who are transported from section to section. If the Senator will read the last proviso in section 4 (a) on page 3, he will find that it says:

> *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

The only exception made which gives any benefit at all to any foreign workers, as the Senator implies, is in the case of agreements which have already been entered into between this Government and the Government of any foreign country for the importation of foreign labor.

The whole provision, in my opinion, was more or less unnecessary. The Senator from Massachusetts knows how the House conferees felt about it and how the House felt about it. Someone had suggested that the Farm Security Administration was organizing unions of farm laborers, and that its officials were seizing upon their power to expend Federal funds as an occasion for imposing certain reforms and certain ideas of some of the employees of the Farm Security Administration on the farmers.

It seems that for some of the migratory farm labor they had undertaken to provide working hours very similar to those prevailing in industry. Everyone familiar with farming knows that a 40-hour week on a farm would be an absurdity, and that any farmer who undertook to farm on the basis of a 40-hour week certainly would come to grief and to failure. So the House had written into this provision the limitation that no part of the funds should be spent by any agency of Government which attempted to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose and enforce collective bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to agricultural laborers whom they might transport.

The Senate undertook to mitigate that provision by providing that with the exception of the existing agreement which had already been entered into, the same rule would apply to foreign labor that applied to labor within the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am much obliged to the Senator for taking the trouble to reply to me at such length. I may say he has given me the best reply I have received so far, and I have been asking a good many questions about the matter. But his reply still does not alter the fact that plain English is plain English, and that this piece of legislation definitely states that—

> (b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or hertofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards—

That is quoted. Then the measure goes on to say—

> except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country.

If it is desired to exclude the Farm Security Administration from conducting such activities, and to include some other agency of the Government, that could be done in simple English, it seems to me, without resorting to language as reactionary as the language contained in the measure before us seems to be.

Mr. President, the hour is growing late. I do not desire to detain the Senate much longer; but I do wish to recapitulate, for the benefit of Senators who were not in the Chamber when I commenced my remarks, my other objection to the measure, which is that it provides for the immigration into this country of native-born residents of the specified countries, and I believe that the phrase "native-born residents" can create a loophole for hostile persons, and possibly for saboteurs, to get into this country; because it is well known—and anyone who has traveled in the Americas is aware—that the machinery there for recording births and for determining whether or not a certain person was born in the particular country concerned is most rudimentary. That fact is recognized in the language of the measure, which, in effect, later on gives the administrative agency the power to admit practically anyone it wishes to admit; because the joint resolution reads:

> And in the event such regulations require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident which he is unable to furnish, such requirement may be waived by the admitting officer of the United States at the point where such resident seeks entry into the United States if such official has other proof satisfactory to him that such resident is a native of the country claimed as his birthplace.

That is the objection I have to the provision. Although it was drawn up with the utmost sincerity, I think it has the effect of being more or less of a joker. I believe it could have been better safeguarded, so that we would get the benefits of importing the labor and producing the agricultural crops without at the same time running the dangers to which the language exposes us.

Certainly, Mr. President, we do not want to lose our heritage for a mess of pottage, or in any way endanger our

country and its institutions because of the existence of an emergency.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a short time ago after the joint resolution was debated on the floor of the Senate, and passed, it was referred to conference, and from the conference this report has come. We have heard a great deal said here about bringing labor into the country. I wish to point out to the Senate that the number of persons who might come in would not be controlled, but that an invitation would be issued to the countries covered by the measure and to their people to apply for admission and to come into this country. For instance, on page 4 of the report, in section 5, paragraph (g) we find this language:

(g) In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident desiring to enter the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax—

And so forth. In other words, the individuals themselves might make application to come into this country, and they would be permitted entry without bond. They would be permitted entry without tax, and their way to enter would be paved. What would the measure do beyond that? It would appropriate $26,000,000 to pay for the travel of persons who might indicate they wanted to enter this country for the purpose specified. It would pay for their housing, for their training, for subsistence, for health service, for burial expenses. I know the answer will be made that there is no immigration quota for persons coming from those countries.

However, what has kept the people of those countries out of our country has been the fact that heretofore they have had to pay their expenses in coming here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will look at page 5 of the report he will find provision that—

Each such resident shall be provided with an identification card (with his photograph and fingerprints) to be prescribed under such regulations which shall be in lieu of all other documentary requirements, including the registration at time of entry or after entry required by the Alien Registration Act of 1940.

The committee considered the whole question which the Senator is now raising; and in order to be certain that the Attorney General would have indisputable evidence as to the identification of the persons concerned, the requirement was made that each one shall be provided with an identification card, with his fingerprints and his photograph, at the time when he comes in.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What the Senator has said goes very much to the question which was discussed—the question of the identification of native-born residents—but I am saying that, in my opinion, under the joint resolution, a flood of those persons will come into this country, for the joint resolution provides that any one of them who may apply for entry into this country may enter, and it further provides for the payment of his expenses in coming into the country and for the payment of his subsistence after he comes in.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator that if I thought that were the case, I would vote against the conference report; but I do not think it is.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I can not see anything else in the language.

I believe it has been stated here by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for whose views and opinions I have great respect that he did not think many persons would come in under the provisions of this measure. I believe he said perhaps 25,000 would come. Suppose 25,000 should come in. I cannot see why only 25,000 would come, with the high wages paid in this country, with traveling expenses offered to them, with their subsistence and housing offered to them, and even their burial expenses offered to them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no more of them will come for a very simple reason. The governments of those countries will not let them leave. In times past as many as 150,000 to 200,000 Mexicans have come across the border and engaged in agriculture, and nobody became excited about it. Now the Mexican Government will not let them come. It has specifically limited the number who may leave Mexico to 50,000. Last year only about 15,000 came.

The same provisions to which the Senator refers as threatening the foundations of the Government were in effect last year. Last year we paid their transportation. Last year, under contract, we agreed to see that they were housed, and that they received as much as 30 cents an hour. We paid for the transportation of household goods, and paid burial expenses. We did all that last year; and yet crops were lost because we could not get enough of them under the conditions of which the Senator complains.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Accepting the figures of the Senator from Georgia, let us assume that 26,000 should come in. It it proposed to appropriate $26,000,000 to look after 26,000 persons.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has evidently not even read the joint resolution. Under section 2, $13,000,000, or half the money to be appropriated, would go directly to the county agents to handle local recruiting within the States. Only $13,000,000 would be available to the Administrator for all the functions he must perform; and all of it cannot be spent, as the Senator says, on transportation, training, and burying of Mexicans, because there are too many other phases of the joint resolution.

The Mexican phase of the joint resolution is a very small matter. Last year something like 200,000 Americans were transported from one section of the country to the other, as has been done for many years past, to engage in agriculture. This year we will continue to transport some of those Americans. Thirteen million dollars of the money will go to the county agents to be used for local recruitment and training of farm labor. The Senator would have the Senate believe that only Mexicans would be involved under the terms of the joint resolution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, no.

Mr. RUSSELL. Less than 4 percent of all the labor involved under the terms of the joint resolution will be labor from Mexico or from any other foreign country.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I stand corrected in that respect. I believe the Senator is correct. But what about the other millions, not only for the Mexicans but for persons from Central and South America and the Bahamas?

Mr. RUSSELL. The only difference between the joint resolution and the existing law is that under the terms of the joint resolution the head tax, which I think amounts to about $8, would be waived. If anyone wishes to come to the United States under the provisions of the joint resolution, he must be an agricultural laborer. He must agree to labor at a certain place and under certain conditions, under the contract which is entered into. The only difference between the present law and the joint resolution is that we waive the payment of the head tax which has heretofore been required, and waive the provisions of the contract-labor law, to permit persons from the United States to go to other countries and undertake to find agricultural laborers. Heretofore that has been prohibited by the immigration law.

At present there is no quota applying to the countries of this hemisphere. Tens of thousands of residents of Canada work in the United States every day. They cross the border and go back. This fact has not been mentioned, but already four or five thousand Canadians have been mobilized, to be brought to New York State, Massachusetts, and other New England States, under the provisions of the joint resolution, to engage in agricultural labor.

So far as foreign labor is concerned, practically the only thing the joint resolution does is to waive the head tax and waive the provisions of the contract-labor law, which thus far has prohibited anyone from bringing in labor under a contract to do agricultural work. Under the provisions of the joint resolution we would pay the transportation of a selected group. That is about the only difference between the joint resolution and the strict requirements of the existing immigration law. Otherwise, there is no departure from the policy which was pursued during the year 1942 by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator speaks of a selected group. Does he mean a selected group of persons from other countries?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do; a selected group of Mexicans, for example.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Wherein is there any selection, when the language of the joint resolution permits anyone who wishes to come in to make application?

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator construe the joint resolution as providing that any person in South America who

wishes to come in will have his transportation paid?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, no.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I had any such view as that about the joint resolution I would vote against it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let us look at the language on page 4, in section 5 (g):

(g) In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident desiring to enter the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917—

And so forth. If that is not an offer to the persons themselves to apply for entry into the United States, rather than the selection of persons, I cannot read or understand language.

Mr. President, the hour is growing late and I know that a vote is desired. I invite attention to subsection (b) of section 4, on page 3, under the heading "Limitations." This section is a limitation upon the expenditure of funds proposed to be appropriated. Subsection (b) provides:

(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or heretofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country:

So far I raise no question; but this language follows:

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

Am I to understand that language to mean that the funds appropriated under the joint resolution, Government funds, may be used to negotiate any labor contract with an employer of farm labor?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the question arose in the Senate committee as to whether or not, under the language of the House bill, which prevented any agency from directly or indirectly fixing wages, any person employed through these funds could be assured the prevailing wage. It occurred to some members of the committee—and I have forgotten who offered the amendment—that it might be difficult to persuade a farmer to leave Georgia and go to work in Florida if the farmer had absolutely no idea what he was going to be paid when he got to Flordia. So this language was inserted in order that those who were attempting to recruit labor could obtain an agreement from the farmer who needed farm laborers that he would pay the prevailing wage. They, in turn, could assure those whom they were seeking to recruit that they would receive fair treatment and shelter if they left their homes and undertook to assist in gathering crops in some other State. That was the purpose of the language.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And it does not go beyond that purpose?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at all.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, this appears to be an appropriation of money to the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution. As I understand, a new office has been created. In effect, a new bureau has been created. In my judgment we have enough bureaus in the Government. I am opposed to the creation of any more, and I am opposed to any measure which would effect that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Guffey	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bone	Holman	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Burton	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bushfield	Lodge	Stewart
Butler	McClellan	Taft
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McNary	Tydings
Danaher	Maloney	Vandenberg
Davis	Maybank	Van Nuys
Eastland	Millikin	Wagner
Ellender	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	White
George	Nye	Willis
Gerry	O'Daniel	Wilson

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McNARY. I think it is desirable to have a yea-and-nay vote, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. BREWSTER's name was called). I announce the absence of my colleague the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], on business of the Senate.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is absent from the city, conducting hearings for the Special Committee to Investigate Production and Uses of Fuel Oils.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the city, conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, holding hearings in the West on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate Small Business Enterprises.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Florida.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Agricultural Labor Shortages.

I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] has been called from the city on public business.

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], who, I am advised, if present and voting, would vote "yea." I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent on official business as members of the Senate committee to investigate production, transportation, and use of fuels in certain areas west of the Mississippi River.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is unavoidably detained on official business. If present he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—39

Aiken	Connally	Hayden
Austin	Eastland	Hill
Bankhead	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Barkley	Ferguson	Kilgore
Bone	George	McClellan
Burton	Gerry	McFarland
Butler	Gillette	McKellar
Chandler	Guffey	Maloney

Maybank	Radcliffe	Tydings
Millikin	Russell	Vandenberg
Murdock	Stewart	Van Nuys
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.	Wagner
Overton	Thomas, Utah	Wallgren

NAYS—18

Bridges	Lodge	Robertson
Bushfield	McNary	Shipstead
Capper	Moore	Taft
Danaher	Nye	White
Davis	O'Daniel	Willis
Holman	Revercomb	Wilson

NOT VOTING—39

Andrews	Downey	Pepper
Bailey	Glass	Reed
Ball	Green	Reynolds
Barbour	Gurney	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hatch	Smith
Brewster	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Buck	La Follette	Truman
Byrd	Langer	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Walsh
Chavez	McCarran	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Murray	Wiley

So the report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR EXERCISE OF STABILIZATION FUND POWERS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, earlier in the day I reported favorably from the Committee on Banking and Currency Senate bill 991 which proposes simply the continuation of the powers relating to the stabilization fund, which has been in existence now for over 9 years. Since all the bill proposes to do is to extend the time within which the powers may be exercised, and since we have passed upon that matter on four different occasions in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered now.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire if the Senator from New York has any further announcement to make in connection with the measure?

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know what the Senator from Michigan means by "further announcement."

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to know if it is definitely understood in connection with this action that the proposal to continue the present power to devalue the dollar is definitely postponed for the session?

Mr. WAGNER. I can only say that the committee passed upon that question and eliminated that feature from the bill. The bill now deals only with the question of stabilizing the foreign exchange of the dollar.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Am I correct in understanding that the remainder of the bill, which has been eliminated for the time being, is not to be renewed?

Mr. WAGNER. Not so far as I know.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I conferred earlier in the day with the able Senator in charge of the bill, and later with the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and I understood the plan was that the devaluation feature would be abandoned for this session.

Mr. WAGNER. That feature has been eliminated from the bill. I take it that is what it means.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is going to be a definite statement to that effect, or I shall object.

Mr. WAGNER. I say that so far as I am concerned it is eliminated and will remain eliminated.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that was the understanding I had, that it was eliminated, and would not again be brought up at this session of the Congress.

Mr. WAGNER. I believe that is true.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 991), to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I want to make it plain that I have consented to this arrangement on the basis of what was specifically stated to me to be the unqualified agreement that the effort to pass legislation extending the power to devalue the dollar will not be resumed at this session.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I should like to inquire who is authorized to enter into such an agreement, and I should like also to be advised if such an agreement has been entered into.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator from Utah is entitled to the information, and I want it also.

Mr. MURDOCK. I certainly want it.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I am opposed to devaluation, but I think it is entirely unfair to ask a Senator to speak for 95 other Members. As the Senator from Michigan knows, any Senator is permitted to offer any special legislation at any time he desires. I do not think it is a fair question, and I do not think it can be fairly answered.

Mr. WAGNER. I can speak for myself and say that I do not propose to do so, if that is what the Senator from Michigan would like to know.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question. He suggests that the question I asked is unfair. I should like to ask if it is not the understanding of the Senator from Connecticut that the statement I have made is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. Frankly, if I understood the Senator's question correctly, I do not think it is correct or fair. Insofar as I am concerned, I do not want the proposal made again. I wanted to see the provision in question stricken out, and I made that proposal in the committee. I was anxious to have it go out, and it was stricken out. But obviously no chairman or any committee member can speak for 95 other Senators as to whether this proposal will again be made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with the Senator. I am asking the Senator whether those who are in charge of the proposed legislation have not asserted as a part of the program to pass the measure this evening, that so far as they are concerned, there will be no effort made to renew the extension of the devaluation feature.

Mr. MALONEY. I think that is true, but it cannot be binding upon every Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is what I want to know.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, but I have been somwhat interested in this particular bill. I think there can be no doubt that there would be no request from the Treasury for the renewal of the devaluation provision, which has been eliminated from the bill, certainly not until after the end of this war, when currency fights of some sort may arise which would then make it necessary to consider a matter of this kind; but certainly not during the war period. I think one might confidently conclude that the Treasury will not again ask the Banking and Currency Committee to consider the devaluation section.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I do not want at all to prolong the discussion. I do not believe anyone is authorized to agree on any such matter as has been suggested. It was my opinion in the Banking and Currency Committee today, and it is still my opinion, that if the Government finds itself rigidly tied to gold, when an international conference on international exchange is held, we will probably find this country at a very decided disadvantage. I do not know at all what the President's attitude is on this matter. I heard the Secretary of the Treasury this morning, and I was rather disappointed in the statement made by him with reference to the devaluation policy. As one member of the Banking and Currency Committee it would not surprise me at all if the President of the United States should be forced by reason of international conditions to ask for an extension of this power, and I certainly do not want to be bound by any such agreement as I have heard suggested this afternoon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 991) which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment. On page 1, after line 9, to strike out section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. The second sentence added to paragraph (b) (2) of section 43, title III, of the act approved May 12, 1933, by section 12 of said Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended to read as follows: "The powers of the President specified in this paragraph shall be deemed to be separate, distinct, and continuing powers, and may be exercised by him, from time to time, severally or together, whenever and as the expressed objects of this section in his judgment may require; except that such powers shall expire June 30, 1945, unless the President shall sooner declare the existing emergency ended."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"(c) All the powers conferred by this section shall expire June 30, 1945, unless the President shall sooner declare the existing emergency ended and the operation of the stabilization fund terminated."

April 2

[PUBLIC LAW 45—78TH CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 82—1ST SESSION]

[H. J. Res. 96]

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $26,100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943, to be expended by the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator"), appointed pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 9322, dated March 26, 1943, for assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, as follows.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities within the several States, the Administrator shall apportion among the several States, on the basis of need, not less than $9,000,000 and not more than $13,050,000 of the sum appropriated by section 1 and the sums so apportioned shall be available for payment to such States for expenditure by the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in such States in accordance with such agreements as may be entered into by the Administrator and such extension services and subject to the supervision of the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may be expended by such extension services shall include, among other things, (1) the recruiting, placement (including the placement of workers as tenants or sharecroppers), and training of such workers; (2) transportation, supervision, subsistence, protection, health and medical and burial services, and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary personal property; (3) lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services, including former Civilian Conservation Corps camps; (4) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within the United States who are under contractual obligation to reimburse such extension services for such advances; (5) employment of personnel and other administrative expenses; and (6) payment to or reimbursement of other public or private agencies or individuals for furnishing services or facilities for such purposes. Such extension services may enter into agreements with other public and private agencies and individuals and utilize the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals in carrying out the purposes of this section.

(b) The Administrator shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts to be paid to each State under

this section and the time or times such amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Administrator, the amounts so certified.

EXPENDITURE OF OTHER FUNDS

SEC. 3. (a) Not more than $13,050,000 of the funds appropriated by section 1 and not apportioned by the Administrator among the several States pursuant to section 2 shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may be expended shall include, among other things, (1) the recruiting and transportation of workers and their families and necessary personal property, within the United States and elsewhere; (2) furnishing, by loans or otherwise, of health and medical and burial services, training, subsistence, allowances, protection, and shelter for such workers and their families; (3) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within the United States who are under contractual obligation to reimburse the United States for such advances; (4) lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services; and (5) operating personnel and expenses to carry out the above purposes.

(b) Not more than 2 per centum of the funds appropriated by section 1 hereof shall be available for administrative expenses of the Administrator, including (1) the employment of persons and organizations, by contract or otherwise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (2) purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; (3) printing and binding; (4) travel expenses of persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating capacities within a foreign country or from a foreign country to the United States and return, including such expenses to first-duty stations; and (5) payment to or reimbursement of other agencies or individuals for administrative expenses incurred by them.

(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution, the Administrator is authorized—

(1) to utilize the facilities, services, and personnel of units and agencies within the Department of Agriculture; to enter into agreements with other public or private agencies or individuals; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals and to delegate to them functions under this joint resolution; and to allocate or transfer funds to (in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944), or otherwise to pay or reimburse such units, agencies, and individuals for expenses in connection therewith;

(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

(3) to cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign governments relating to the importation of workers into the United States.

LIMITATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension

agent of such county, if such worker has resided in such county for a period of one year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period.

(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or heretofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be expended without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) Any payments made by the United States or other public or private agencies or employers to aliens brought into the United States under this joint resolution shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution—

(1) the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico;

(2) the term "worker" includes nationals of the United States and aliens;

(3) the term "agricultural labor" includes any services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(d) Effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3 of the Act of June 29, 1936 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 433), receipts derived for the account of the United States from the use and occupancy of agricultural labor supply centers, including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(e) The former Civilian Conservation Corps camps shall be transferred without charge to the Administrator, to the extent that he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution: *Provided*, That no such camp which is being utilized by any other agency of the Government, or which has been transferred to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization, shall be transferred to the Administrator under this subsection without the consent of such agency, State, county, municipality, or organization.

(f) Notwithstanding provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance),

and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of April 1943, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual arising from agricultural labor performed by him as an employee, or from labor otherwise performed by him in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities, after the date of enactment of this joint resolution and prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

(g) In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident desiring to enter the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by Section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges, and shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of Section 3 of such Act which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage by corporations, foreign government, or others; and any such resident shall be admitted to perform agricultural labor in the United States for such time and under such conditions (but not including the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States) as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General; and in the event such regulations require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident which he is unable to furnish, such requirement may be waived by the admitting officer of the United States at the point where such resident seeks entry into the United States if such official has other proof satisfactory to him that such resident is a native of the country claimed as his birthplace. Each such resident shall be provided with an identification card (with his photograph and fingerprints) to be prescribed under such regulations which shall be in lieu of all other documentary requirements, including the registration at time of entry or after entry required by the Alien Registration Act of 1940. Any such resident admitted under the foregoing provisions who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission shall be taken into custody under a warrant issued by the Attorney General at any time after entry and deported in accordance with Section 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917. Sections 5 and 6 of such Act shall not apply to the importation of aliens under this joint resolution. No provision of this joint resolution shall authorize the admission into the United States of any enemy alien.

Approved April 29, 1943.

Oct. 27

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1493

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER 29 (legislative day, OCTOBER 25), 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of California introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

A BILL

To amend section 3 (a) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943", approved April 29, 1943, as amended:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 3 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943", approved April 29, 1943, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "and" before the figure "(5)" in the last sentence in such subsection; and by striking out the period at the end of such sentence and inserting in

1 lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "and (6) fur-
2 nishing, by loans or otherwise, of health and medical serv-
3 ices to migratory workers engaged in agricultural work, and
4 to members of the families of such workers, to whom ade-
5 quate health and medical services are not otherwise available
6 in the area where they are employed, whether or not such
7 workers have been recruited or transported pursuant to this
8 joint resolution."

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1493

A BILL

To amend section 3 (a) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943", approved April 29, 1943, as amended.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California

OCTOBER 29 (legislative day, OCTOBER 25), 1943

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations